JULY 1948 PRICE 1s. 3d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—The Lyman Beecher Lectures—Dr. Farmer on the Christian Message and the World of Persons—'A Grave Diligence for High Things'—Professor D. M. Baillie's 'God Was in Christ.' 253

II. UNSOLVED NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORSHIP OF 1 PETER. By the Very Reverend E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Winchester . . . 256

III. LITERATURE 259

IV. ISAAC WATTS. By Professor Norman V. Hope, B.D., Ph.D., Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. . 264

V. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 268
2. The Christian Year 269

VI. THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE TO-DAY. By the Reverend A. Herbert Gray, D.D., London 275

VII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
A Suggested Exegesis of 2 Kings v. 15–18. By the Reverend A. T. Rich, B.A., B.D., Axminster 278
Luke xvi. 10. By the Reverend Fred C. Anderson, M.A., Dundee . . . 278

VIII. ENTRE NOUS—A Picture—What Life Has Taught Me 279

VOLUME LIX. No. 10

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

World Christianity

Yesterday Today Tomorrow

by HENRY P. VAN DUSEN, D.D.

A searching examination of the situation of the Church in the world today and the prospect for Christianity in the world of tomorrow, by an outstanding leader in the Christian life of America and in the world-wide ecumenical movement. 8s 6d net

Men and Women *

by GILBERT RUSSELL, M.B., Ch.B.

The deep issues and meanings in the relations between men and women are discussed here as well as practical problems of today. 6s net

Our Trespasses *

A Study In Christian Penitence

by MARTIN JARRETT-KERR

Intended to help ordinary intelligent people to find out what a "sense of sin" really means and what should be done about it. 6s net

Religious Liberty *

by CECIL NORTHCOTT

Religious liberty is threatened in many parts of the modern world. It is important that the situation and its implications should be faced and understood. 6s net

Dostoevsky *by* L. A. ZANDER

Dostoevsky wrestled in his books with the problem of the good and the evil in the human heart. Both for the literary student and for the philosopher Professor Zander's study of Dostoevsky's thought and characters will prove illuminating. Translated from the Russian by Natalie Duddington. 10s net

Behind that Wall *by* E. ALLISON PEERS

An introduction to some classics of the interior life. 'There is the usual fullness of knowledge, the aptness, and the same fine spirit to which we have become accustomed in all this scholar does. . . . He must be a strange soul who cannot in this little book find something wise and helpful.'—*Expository Times.* 6s net

* *These are the latest books issued to the 12,000 members of the* **SCM Religious Book Club** *at the privileged price of* **2s 6d** *each. Enrolment Form with full particulars on request.*

SCM PRESS

56 Bloomsbury Street, London WC1

New Books

A PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION
EDWIN LEWIS 15s. *net*

BUDDHISM (I. HINAYANA)
C. H. S. WARD 7s. 6d. *net*

THE NEGLECTED FACTOR
CYRIL H. POWELL, B.A. 6s. *net*

MAHARAJAHS, MISERY AND MAGIC
CYRIL J. DAVEY 5s. *net*

THE PATTERN IN THE MOUNT
Hebrew Ideas and their influence on Christianity
D. HOWARD SMITH, B.A., B.D. 5s. *net*

A PRIMER OF OLD TESTAMENT TEXT CRITICISM
D. R. Ap-THOMAS, M.A., B.D. 3s. *net*

of all booksellers

LONDON: THE EPWORTH PRESS

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS

THE DAWN BREAKS
W. D. GRENFELL
Describes triumphs of the Gospel in Africa
5s. net. Postage 4d.

THROUGH TOIL AND TRIBULATION
The Experiences and Wartime Service of 23 Interned Missionaries
6s. net. Postage 6d.

WHEN THE SONG BEGAN
G. E. HICKS
A Story of Work among Lepers and Outcastes
2s. 6d. net. Postage 3d.

THE LIVING CHRIST IN MODERN CHINA
GEORGE YOUNG
A Heart-gripping Story of the Triumphs of God's Grace in China
2nd Edition 7s. 6d. net. Postage 5d.

THE BOOK OF THE REVELATION
J. O. BARRETT
5s. net. Postage 3d.

6 Southampton Row, London, W.C.1

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Lyman Beecher Lectures at the Divinity School of Yale were delivered in April 1946 by Dr. H. H. FARMER under the appropriate title of 'The Christian Message and the World of Persons,' and are now published here under the title of *God and Men*.[1] The Lyman Beecher Lectures were really meant to be on Preaching but the object has recently been broadened to include any theme bearing on the work of a Christian minister. And the original object is so far honoured by Dr. FARMER that his declared purpose is 'to be of some help to working ministers in their difficult task in making the Christian message living and credible to ordinary men and women to-day.'

This, indeed, is the direct subject of the first lecture which is on 'The Way of Knowledge.' The contemporary situation and the contemporary mind are such, says Dr. FARMER, that it is most important that the great verities of the Christian revelation should be so presented and taught that three conditions at least are fulfilled. First, they should be so presented that the *massive unity and consistency* of the Christian view are made clear and intelligible. The scrappy, disconnected and only half-understood bits of Christian doctrine, which so many people take to be what they call 'Christianity,' are of little more use in the turmoil and perplexity of this time than would be a few scattered heaps of stones as a breakwater on a stormy coast.

Second, they should be so presented that the *distinctiveness* of the Christian view is made unmistakably plain, that is to say that what Christianity teaches about God and Man sets it apart from all other interpretations of life which compete for the allegiance of men to-day. If Christian people are not soundly instructed in a truth which is in sharp opposition to much that rules men's minds they will be defenceless against the infiltration of a contemporary culture that is profoundly unchristian.

Third, it is important to present the great verities of our faith so that *their radical and consistent personalism* is convincingly set forth. In this matter of its intense personalism we are confronted with *the* central issue in the relations of Christian truth to the contemporary mind. This is a world of persons, not only of things. It is a world in which personal relationships, of God and men and of men with men, are everything, in which the claim of God on men and of men on one another is paramount. Its radical personalism is the essence of Christianity.

This subject of the right way to approach and to explore the Christian teaching is therefore of supreme moment in relation to the task of presenting the truth to men and women to-day, and to this Dr. FARMER at once addresses himself. And he begins by saying that if the truth of the Christian message is to come home to any man he must bring to it the most serious mind he can command. He must be aware of how much is at stake in the matter; he must keep himself open and responsive to the great things in life; he must have what Morley attributes to Burke, 'a grave diligence for high things'; he must realize that the decision between belief and unbelief in such a world as this at such a time as this is a grave decision. No respect at all is due to the man who brings to the matter a casual, flippant, 'feet on the mantelpiece' attitude. The word 'God' most certainly comes to us from out of the past charged with the most poignant experiences of great and holy men, charged with the hopes and fears, the heroisms and sacrifices of countless men and women, known and unknown. What is due to it is 'a grave diligence for high things.'

Second, if the truth of the Christian message is to come home to a man he must bring to it a certain practical alertness and expectancy. What Dr. FARMER means is that the merely intellectual attitude to truth, the theoretical, lecture-room approach, the mental, abstract, generalized way of regarding truth to which we are brought by argument and exposition tends to side-track and obscure the fact of God's claim on us as persons which is involved in God being the Living God. It is as though one were to put on glasses in order

[1] Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net.

to examine the properties of steam. The glasses, useful in countless ways, in this instance are 'mist up,' clouding and distorting the reality they are meant to reveal. In short, in approaching truth we must *first* ask: 'What has this to do with me?'

Third, if the truth of the Christian message is to come home to a man, he must bring to it a certain sincerity and singleness of mind. In the last resort there is only one reason for believing anything to be true, and that is that we can't help believing it to be true. At some point truth must shine in its own light and lay hold of the mind with direct compelling power. This does not mean that we are *not* entitled to believe anything that does not immediately shine in its own light. Dr. FARMER takes the truth that the three angles of any triangle together make up two right angles. Here you move by rational steps, each of which you cannot question, to the conclusion. The appeal of truth, apart from such as Euclid deals with, is to a man's direct sense of truth, and calls for a certain sincerity and singleness of mind.

Fourth, if the truth of the Christian message is to come home to a man it must always be set in an adequate context. It is, for example, absurd to ask for proof of God's existence by the same process as you prove the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles. If the whole meaning of existence is in God, a neat little packet of logic is not sufficient to authenticate His reality to us. Or, take another example from the evil in the world. We ought certainly to face this. But we ought to take into view the good in the world, the great things of life. And among the great things of life the infinite depth and mystery of the universe must be included. The very notion of God includes mystery as part of its essential meaning. In a world which had not this 'fourth dimension' of mystery the Christian religion could not live at all. In Rudolf Otto's words, 'it could not sail on its shallow waters, or breathe its thin air.'

Finally, if the truth of the Christian message is to come home to a man he must bring to it something of the spirit of adventure. We must avoid that false and finicky intellectual conscience which is over scrupulous about the matter of belief. Dr. FARMER takes an illustration from the duty to care for our health. We ought to do this, but we can be too fussy about it. Dr. FARMER knew a lady who took this obligation so seriously that she became a burden to herself and everybody else and in the end defeated her own intention. She never used a telephone without wiping the mouthpiece with a disinfectant. She took her own cup wherever she went. She made a point of washing out her own and her children's insides with drugs and purgatives of singular and often unpredictable potency. She lived in fear of picking up germs; the result was that she was always picking them up. Similarly, it is possible to take our obligation to seek and find truth in all things so seriously that we do in fact find error and avoid truth.

Truth has a self-authenticating power and it authenticates itself to us when we adventurously commit ourselves to it. This is the point of William James's great essay in 'The Will to Believe.' He maintains that we have two alternatives, to regard the pursuit of truth as paramount and the avoidance of error as secondary, or the reverse. It is worth while risking being duped sometimes for the blessing of real knowledge. It is, of course, advisable to be on our guard against wishful thinking. Our wishes and desires may fog reality. But, on the other hand, our wishes and desires may be indispensable factors in knowing reality. As James puts it: 'dupery for dupery, what proof is there that dupery through hope is so much worse than dupery through fear?' It will be apparent that in Dr. FARMER there are both the capacity for deep thinking and the gift of lucid exposition. His book is an enlightening and practically helpful guide to the understanding of our times and the gospel that can alone meet its needs.

In a profound and brilliant book, *God Was in Christ* (Faber & Faber; 16s. net), Professor D. M. BAILLIE, D.D., of St. Andrews ranges over the whole field of Christology. There is not a page that does not reveal a rare union of spiritual fervour and philosophical acumen and masterly scholarship in the regions of New Testament Criticism and Church History.

The problem of Christology can be quite simply stated. Unless we ignore or regard as illusory the evidence we find Jesus presented to us as a man, our brother, and also as one accorded and accepting a reverence amounting to worship. Now it is as easy to say in a sentence that Jesus was both human and Divine as to say a square circle. The problem is whether such a statement can be made that has an intelligible meaning and is an achievement of speculative thought covering all the facts and removing all the difficulties felt in their simultaneous occurrence, or whether all that

can be reached is a formula like the phrase God Incarnate, which amounts to no more than an assertion that a mystery exists for which thought and language are inadequate, coupled with an affirmation that the mystery belongs to the facts and is not created by human misunderstanding.

Dr. BAILLIE's final conclusion seems to be that Christology results in such a recognition rather than in a solution of the problem. But his fresh point is that it means much to recognize that the problem is one of religious reality. The best clue to thought about it he finds in the Pauline experience ' I live ; yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me,' and in the familiar fact that the Christian takes no credit for his good works, for they are not his own but fruits of the Spirit, the result of enabling grace. He finds in such common human experience, which can hardly be stated except in contradictory terms, a point of view from which to perceive if not to comprehend the union of human and Divine in Jesus.

Like other modern writers Dr. BAILLIE makes much use of the term ' paradox.' Without suggesting for a moment that he himself is ever self-deluded it may be said that the free use of this term may tend to produce the impression that the word marks an attainment rather than a frustration of thought. A more serious question is how far, in thus contemplating the union of human and Divine on the deepest level of moral activity and spiritual experience, Dr. BAILLIE means to suggest that in such experience in its perfection the difference between Divine and human vanishes and with it the problem of Christology.

Another suggestion may be that Dr. BAILLIE has not made all that might be made of his clue. The union of human and Divine in which he finds the clue is action. And a thing is what it does. May it not be that speculation on Christology might be carried successfully further by a philosophy and criticism that finds reality to consist in action and interprets Jesus in terms of His activity and function as agent of the living God rather than as a static or dramatic revelation of the Divine Nature.

The first part of Dr. BAILLIE's book is a study of the curious modern situation in regard to the New Testament, where criticism is more radical and theology more Biblical than a generation ago. He sustains a forceful argument that criticism and dogmatics cannot be left to go their separate ways. He gives a powerful vindication of the soundness of the purpose of liberal theology and the value of its achievement, though imperfect, in presenting the figure of the historical Jesus, and he protests against a defeatist temper in face of the difficulties, and has no doubt that critical scholars must keep hopefully at their task. He goes further perhaps than Dr. W. Manson in regarding Form Criticism as a total method of gospel study and not just a particular tool that may have its special applications.

In rebutting the scornful estimate of liberal theology by the Barthian School he says, ' there is no stability in a position which accepts to the full the humanity of Christ, but has no interest in its actual concrete manifestation and doubts whether it can be recaptured at all ; which insists on the " once-for-all-ness " of this Divine incursion into history but renounces all desire or claim to know what it was really like,' and he quotes some astonishing passages to illustrate that supercilious attitude to the gospel story as when Barth says in his ' Doctrine of the Word of God ' (p. 188) that Jesus the Rabbi of Nazareth is ' one who is so apt to impress us as a little commonplace alongside more than one other founder of a religion ' ; and Bultmann in ' Jesus and the Word ' (p. 8) says, ' interest in the personality of Jesus is excluded ' ; and Brunner in ' The Divine Imperative ' (p. 320) says, ' The idea of a sinless historical human life is from the Christian point of view an impossible idea. The Jesus of history is not the same as the Christ of faith.' Barth's theology, Dr. BAILLIE says, ' may be a theology of the Word but is not a theology of the Word made flesh.'

On the other hand, with the same decision and with mastery of the course of ancient controversies and the paths and by-paths of modern dogmatic thought, Dr. BAILLIE comes down against any inclination in the historical school to deny the need for doctrinal addition to the results of their investigation. The fact that Jesus revealed or taught about God inevitably raises the question of His relation to God. The idea of the Fatherhood of God involves the need for a Christology. The historical figure of Jesus is not rightly estimated except as giving the clue to the meaning of all history, and this again implies a Christological estimate.

Unsolved New Testament Problems.

The Problem of the Authorship of 1 Peter.

By the Very Reverend E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Winchester.

'The intrinsic qualities of our Epistle entitle it to an assured place among the Holy Scriptures of the Christian faith, whoever may have been the author or whenever he may have written.' These words from Dr. Beare's Introduction to his valuable edition of 1 Peter will be echoed by the upholders of its authenticity no less than by those who think it pseudonymous; and it derives added weight from his recognition that the Epistle presents 'the common teaching' of the Christian society. Yet that does not quite mean for us that 'the question of authorship becomes unimportant'; because, if the theory of the Petrine authorship gives to the Epistle an internal unity and a directness of reference which it would not otherwise possess, and illuminates certain passages otherwise obscure, something of real value is gained. And it must be remembered that the *onus probandi* rests primarily on those who dispute its authenticity. Its attestation in antiquity is widespread, early and clear; and Eusebius, who mentions unequivocally the doubts attaching to the rest of the 'Petrine' literature, seems unaware of any similar doubts in regard to 1 Peter. The difficulties felt to attach to the traditional view arise from certain features of the Epistle itself; and they are worth examining afresh. They fall naturally into three classes—doctrinal, literary, and historical.

The doctrinal difficulty is usually expressed by saying that the Epistle is steeped in Paulinism, and could therefore only have been written after at least a partial collection of St. Paul's letters was in circulation. 'Entire passages,' says Dr. Beare, 'are little more than an expansion or restatement of Pauline texts, and whole verses are a kind of mosaic of Pauline words and forms of expression.' The theory of Paulinism in 1 Peter had been often reiterated. Yet I confess that I find it more and more puzzling; for when one reflects that St. Paul's distinctive doctrines of Justification and the Atonement, of Grace and Sin, and of the union of the believer with Christ are absent from 1 Peter, that behind St. Paul no less than behind St. Peter lay 'the common teaching' of the Church, that this teaching inevitably found expression in a common vocabulary (witness ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος in 2 Th 2^{13} and 1 P 1^{2}), and that in many instances this common stock of ideas and phrases can be reasonably assigned to common sources, the 'Paulinist' case surely wears very thin. Moreover, you cannot have it both ways. Dr. Beare makes a good deal of the meagreness of the references in 1 Peter to the transforming power of the Spirit. In view of 1 P $1^{2.\ 11.\ 12}$ and 4^{14} and of the use of πνευματικός in 2^{5}, I should prefer to call the allusions primitive rather than meagre; but in so far as St. Paul's characteristic doctrine of the Spirit is omitted, the case for 'Paulinism' is surely correspondingly reduced.

The literary difficulty is more serious, and indeed insuperable unless we reckon that St. Peter not only employed (as everyone did) an amanuensis, but also that his amanuensis was a good Grecian and, in Dr. Beare's words, 'a man of letters, skilled in all the devices of rhetoric, and able to draw upon an extensive and even learned vocabulary.' But why should not St. Peter have employed such a man, and why should he not have been the Silvanus whom we know as St. Paul's collaborator in the Thessalonian Epistles and his colleague on his travels? A Hellenistic Jew, with gifts such as this Epistle presupposes in its amanuensis, was just the man needed for the tasks assigned to him in Acts. Dr. Beare makes a good deal of the fact that the author of 1 Peter was well acquainted with the Septuagint; but it was surely precisely for such men as he that the Septuagint translation was made. There must have been thousands of Jews in the Dispersion who knew no other version. He adds, further, that his knowledge of the Greek Old Testament was a literary knowledge rather than that of a man who had been brought up on Judaism. His reasons are: first, that his attitude to the Torah is too detached, and reveals too little tension between the claims of the Law and the Gospel, to be the work of a converted Jew—a strange commentary, indeed, on the 'Paulinist' theory; and, secondly, that his phraseology betrays the fact that he had 'known them as a devotee.' But no one who appreciates the supple intellect of the educated Jew and its power of entering into the thought as well as the language of other cultures, will regard such a hypothesis as required, or even probable, in the circumstances. Echoes of terminology from the mystery-cults are perhaps to be found in $1^{2.\ 23}$ and 2^{2}; but they are no more than might be expected of a skilful writer who was not loth to catch the attention of the Gentiles among his readers. Religion, no less than medicine, has its homœopathy; and theologians in the last century have not been the worse advocates because they have often applied to their

work the terms made familiar by the discoverers of Evolution.

However, the determining factor in our problem is neither doctrinal nor literary, but historical: if the persecutions alluded to in the Epistle cannot be dated within the life-time of St. Peter, then the case for its authenticity fails. Sir William Ramsay, in *The Church in The Roman Empire*, solved the dilemma by the view that St. Peter was not martyred until A.D. 75–80; and though this view has had no supporters, it at least indicates his feelings as to the weight of argument which Hort brought to bear in favour of the Petrine authorship. The *crux* of the problem lies in the nature of the trials or sufferings to which the Epistle alludes.

The first of these allusions ($1^{6.7}$) need not detain us long; its terms are general (ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς), and the πειρασμοί were of a local and haphazard kind (εἰ δέον ἐστί); the language used is not, in fact, as strong as that found in 1 Th $3^{3ff.}$, 2 Th $1^{4ff.}$. The second allusion (3^{13-17}) refers even more clearly to a contingency rather than to a general experience; but some scholars, including both Ramsay and Beare, hold that $3^{15.16}$ must necessarily imply official persecution by process of law; and it is this belief which leads the former to require a Flavian date for the Epistle and the latter to connect it with Pliny's governorship of Bithynia. Further, though several commentators for various reasons hold that 4^{12-19} refers to a persecution more severe and more deliberate than those implied in the earlier passages, and may therefore be by a different hand or at least written at a later date than what precedes, it will be convenient to consider that passage here along with 3^{13-17}; for the exegetical problems in the two passages are substantially the same.

The words used to describe the sufferings of the Christians are of great importance. They are, or may be, 'spoken against' (καταλαλεῖσθε, 3^{16}), 'reproached in Christ's name' (ὀνειδίζεσθε, 4^{14}), and their Christian way of life 'upbraided' (ἐπηρεάζοντες, 3^{16}). None of these words could be suitably used of an accusation in a Court of Law, nor could be held to imply it; they are all regular terms for social gossip and slander. Nor is there any reason why the language of 3^{15} should refer to legal process either. ἀπολογία and its verb ἀπολογεῖσθαι, for instance, are used frequently by Plato of the normal ebb and flow of argument and discussion; and it is in this sense that St. Paul uses one or other in 1 Co 9^{3}, 2 Co 7^{11} and 12^{19}. The words are best translated by 'plea' and 'plead.' Either may refer to a plea in Court, and the verb is often so used in Acts; but neither is limited to that connotation. Similarly, ἀπαιτεῖν λόγον is used by Plato (*Republic*, 599B; cf. *Protagoras*, 336c) in a purely dialectical sense; and though it is found in the orators with a forensic meaning, any such limitation would seem to be ruled out by the almost casual ring of St. Peter's phrase, παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι (*any one who asks*). The situation envisaged was undoubtedly unpleasant, as were those often described in Acts or that alluded to in 1 and 2 Thessalonians; passions, often fomented by slander, were aroused, and social ostracism, economic persecution, and even violence (which might be fatal) followed. But there is nothing which requires an imperial policy or rescript to explain it.

Is the case different when we come to 4^{15}? I cannot think so. Ramsay claims that 'the Christians are addressed as persons exposed to suffer death.' A murderer, no doubt, would be liable to the death penalty; but would a thief or a 'busybody'? No doubt such a person would suffer, and perhaps suffer more severely if the *odium* of the Christian name attached to him; but though capital punishment was far commoner in imperial times than in the later period of the republic, there was a great variety of punishments for different kinds of offence (cf. *A Companion to Latin Studies*, 332–340). Not that the possibility of death is excluded here. St. Paul nearly lost his life at Lystra (Ac 14^{19}) and quite expected, when he set out from Cæsarea, that he might die for the name of the Lord Jesus at Jerusalem (Ac 21^{13}). It may well be, indeed, that it was in some such outburst of mob-violence that the otherwise unknown Antipas met his martyrdom (Rev 2^{13}). Further, we need not exclude the possibility of the popular hostility to Christianity issuing sometimes in capital charges.[1] E. G. Hardy (*Studies in Roman History*, ch. 3) points out how careful St. Paul was to clear himself before Festus of charges of sedition (Ac 25^{8}), such as were certainly made against him before the municipal magistrates at Thessalonica (Ac 17^{7}); and not every Christian of the provinces addressed in 1 Peter was in the fortunate position of being able at the crucial moment to appeal to Cæsar. As to the name 'Christian,' that was no novelty when 1 Peter was written (cf. Ac 11^{26} 26^{28}); and there was ample time, by the date St. Paul reached Rome, for the Roman authorities to realize that what St. Paul preached was, in effect, a universal religion and therefore potentially dangerous to the imperial power (cf. Hardy, *op.cit.*, 48).

Hardy also makes it clear that the Roman authorities prepared to move in response to public opinion rather than in advance of it; and it was

[1] The lengths to which even men of eminence will go under the influence of religious prejudice is well illustrated in Arthur Bryant's account of the Popish Plot in Charles II.'s time (*Samuel Pepys: The Years of Peril*, chs. 8–11).

the charge of *odium generis humani*, which, according to Tacitus, enabled Nero to make them the scapegoats for his own notorious incendiarism. The charge arose, no doubt, out of their abstention from the social gatherings and popular amusements of the day—a point well illustrated for the provinces by 1 P 4^{2-5}; though I see no reason to suppose that they were guilty of any such 'disregard of the primary rights and obligations of social and family life' as Hardy imputes to them. Indeed, the wide use of a social and domestic code or codes in the primitive Church (for which the New Testament evidence given in my edition is supported by Dr. Daube's evidence from Jewish sources) is almost proof positive to the contrary. Their pure way of life and their obstinacy in clinging to it, together with their contempt for idolatry (cf. Ac 19), and the loss which this threatened to the purveyors of idols and of sacrificial meats, suffice to account for the charge. And we may be sure that the most would be made of any moral backsliding or any tactlessness in propaganda.

In this matter of persecution, therefore, I conclude that the language of the Epistle in no way requires us to postulate a situation substantially different from that attested by the Pauline Epistles and the Acts. We know that St. Paul's visits to cities in the provinces frequently ended in uproar which made the profession of Christianity a precarious matter even when he had gone. Tacitus tells us that before the great fire of A.D. 64 the Christians were unpopular enough in Rome to be regarded as haters of the human race. 1 Peter bears witness to a similar situation in the northern part of Asia Minor; and St. Peter's correspondence will have revealed to him the same symptoms of public hostility as he observed growing in the capital. There may even have been in Asia Minor persecution of a more official kind, which has left no other literary trace; though the hypothesis seems to me unnecessary. Once we realize that, as Mommsen said, the persecution of the Christians in the first century was 'a standing matter' (*The Provinces of the Roman Empire* [1886], ii. 199, n.), we need look no further for an explanation of the πύρωσις to which our author refers. The circumstances were inevitably such as would test the mettle of the Christians' faith.

With this bogy—as I believe it to be—out of the way, we are able to give full weight to those positive indications which the Epistle gives of coming from the mind of the Apostle Peter, writing through his trusted secretary Silvanus. I can illustrate them only briefly here, and for a fuller statement must refer to the Introduction to my Commentary and to the relevant Notes on the Epistle itself. There is, first, the remarkable series of similarities between this Epistle and St. Peter's speeches in Acts. St. Luke is generally reckoned to have had access to sources, or to at least one written source for his narrative in Ac 1–15, and whatever latitude he is allowing himself in his presentation of these speeches, the rough Semitic style and primitive doctrine show through. It is important, therefore, to observe how closely these speeches agree with the Epistle in their conception of the Atonement, based in both cases on Is 53, of the cleansing power of faith (Ac 15^{9}, 1 P 1^{22}), of the Cross as τὸ ξύλον (Ac 5^{30} 10^{39}, 1 P 2^{24}), of God as no 'respecter of persons' (Ac 10^{34}, 1 P 1^{17}), and of Christ as the 'stone' of Ps 118^{22} (Ac 4^{11}, 1 P 2^{7}). The last of these may well have figured in the earliest 'testimony-book,' but the argument is not thereby invalidated.

There is next the large number of *verba Christi* which can be traced below the surface of the Epistles. A wide field of study lies open here to scholars, and one which in its early stages requires no great supply of books. The *verba Christi* lying behind 1 Peter seem to be predominantly Matthæan, and have obvious affinities with Q, but a minute study might well indicate that we ought to speak of QQ rather than Q, and that some of the *verba Christi* traceable in this Epistle point rather to what one may call 'ear-witness' than to written sources.

Finally, there are several passages which take on a new and more vivid meaning if St. Peter were the author; note, in particular, 1^{8}, and the Passion-narrative in 2^{20-25}. Even more striking in 5^{1}, where the author speaks of himself not only as a witness of Christ's sufferings but also as a 'participant in the glory that shall be revealed'; and just as the first clause shows him to have been an eye-witness of the Passion, so the second must, I believe, refer to the Transfiguration. The grounds are psychological as well as grammatical: if the writer were referring to a future experience, he would have written κοινωνήσων, and if that is what he meant, he would have been expressing an easy self-confidence which seems wholly out of keeping both with what this Epistle reveals of its author and with what we know of St. Peter from the Passion onwards. On the contrary, the claim implied here is stated with complete self-effacement, and with none of the artificiality which has led commentators on 2 P 1^{16-18} to regard the allusion to the Transfiguration there as evidence against the authenticity of that Epistle rather than in favour of it. In 1 Peter the allusion comes exactly at the right place and in the right way; in this closing and most personal part of his Epistle the author speaks out of his own most intimate memories of his Master, whom he and they alike have been called to serve.

Literature.

THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ.

PROBABLY none of the Indian classics is more likely to appeal to the Western mind than the Bhagavadgītā. Mr. Gandhi once announced, 'I find a solace in the Bhagavadgītā that I miss even in the Sermon on the Mount. When disappointment stares me in the face, and all alone I see not one ray of light, I go back to the Bhagavadgītā. I find a verse here and a verse there, and I immediately begin to smile in the midst of overwhelming tragedies—and my life has been full of external tragedies—and if they have left no visible, no indelible, scar on me, I owe it to the teachings of the Bhagavadgītā.'

That was his opinion and his experience, to be treated with respect; though, with the best will in the world to be catholic-minded, to us Westerners the judgment in the first sentence seems inexplicable and sadly prejudiced.

However that may be, the famous book seems to be making way. Several new editions and translations of it have appeared in recent years. Here is another, and a notable one. *The Bhagavadgītā*: with an Introductory Essay, Sanskrit Text, English Translation and Notes, by Professor S. Radhakrishnan (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net).

When a learned and devout Hindu, none more outstanding in his generation, opens his heart to us as, passage by passage, he comments on a book that has been so much to his soul, one may, at times, feel he is reading into it what is not obviously there, but one listens in silence and with respectful attention, and does not wish to criticize. This man, writing, so to speak, from the inside, is not to be lightly interrupted. And, indeed, he is, surely, a dull soul who is not moved by much in a book that has meant so very much to so very many; and dim of vision, if he cannot see something at least of what they saw.

And this the more seeing that its understanding of religion—what it is, and what are its claims upon us—is much nearer the ideal that we cherish than is that of most Indian sacred writings, to us alien and unsatisfying; always excepting Ramanuja.

The Introductory Essay of some eighty pages is, as one should expect, full of knowledge, wholly admirable in spirit, and really valuable as a guide. For neither Hinduism, nor this particular expression of it, is a consistent whole. Far otherwise! In both, there are modes of thought that clash noisily in our ears. And one watches with admiration how the commentator picks his way through the difficulties. And how modern and urgent for us still are the problems with which the *Gita* deals. The dramatic opening, when on the very verge of battle a great warrior is overwhelmed by his sudden pacifist doubts; the central theme, How can we live in the Highest Self, and yet continue to work in the world?; and that cry of the heart from one completely puzzled as to his duty in this difficult life, 'Illumine my consciousness. Remove what is dark in me. Give me that which I have lost, a clear rule of action'—these enigmas are still with us, and the answers that the *Gita* offers are moving and impressive.

Nine years ago Rudolph Otto issued a translation and commentary, and sought to rediscover the original form of the famous Song. Radhakrishnan mentions it at times. But he does not include it in his bibliography. Perhaps he dislikes these inquisitive fingers, teasing at what is to him so sacred; perhaps he differs from the conclusions that the other reached. I do not know.

But, with editions of it in our reach by two such scholars, not to mention others, there is no possible excuse for any of us being ignorant of one of the great Scriptures of the world.

A. J. GOSSIP.

OLD TESTAMENT POETRY.

Few books on the Old Testament have had a wider circulation during the past quarter of a century than Professor Theodore H. Robinson's 'Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel.' A large circle of readers will therefore welcome the same author's new book, *The Poetry of the Old Testament* (Duckworth; 6s. net). (The title on the dust-cover and in the publishers' advertisement is *The Poetry and Poets of the Old Testament*, which is exactly parallel with that of the volume on Prophecy.) Dr. Robinson says in his Preface that 'the following pages contain the substance of a course of lectures delivered in alternate years at Cardiff over a quarter of a century.' This is not to say that the volume is 'textbooky.' It is 'not a transcript of the lectures given in any one year. For one thing, no written copy exists.' The general public, for whom it is intended as well as for university students, will find it, like all Dr. Robinson's work, most readable. Indeed, they are likely to exclaim that if university lectures are like these, happy are the students who are privileged to attend them.

The book contains eleven chapters, of which the first is headed 'Prose and Poetry,' and is based on notes of a lecture given by Mr. E. C. Llewellyn, Professor of English in University College, Cardiff. Chapter II. is an account of the Forms of Hebrew Verse, its Parallelism and Prosody, so clear that a knowledge of Hebrew is not essential to an appreciation of it. Next comes a chapter on the Isolated Poems which are to be found in the Pentateuch and Historical Books. Then follow two chapters on Job. These are the best in the book, remarkable alike for their literary and religious insight. Three chapters are devoted to the Psalms, and one each to Proverbs, The Song of Songs, and Lamentations.

A striking feature of the book is that Dr. Robinson manages to make his treatment of critical questions fully abreast of international discussion, without wearying his 'general public'

with the names of scholars outside this country whose works they may have neither the time nor the equipment to study. This loss, if it be a loss from the standpoint of the more advanced student, is compensated for by the annotated Bibliography, which has been compiled by Dr. A. R. Johnson, the most distinguished of Professor Robinson's students, and now his successor in the Chair of Semitic Languages in the University College, Cardiff. The book is 'affectionately dedicated' to Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley, 'to whose scholarship, collaboration, and friendship the author owes so much.' Surely no partnership in Biblical studies in our time has been more fruitful than theirs.

C. R. NORTH.

ST. PAUL AND RABBINIC JUDAISM.

Was Paul a Hebrew of the Hebrews, or a Hellenist of the Hellenists? The question, to be sure, states the antithesis too sharply. Neither phrase can be the complete answer; for we know, on the one hand, that he was brought up as 'the Hebrew son of Hebrew parents' and, on the other, that most of his active life as a Christian missionary was spent in a Hellenistic *milieu*. More accurately posed, the question should be: Which was the primary, the dominant element in Paul's thinking—his Hebrew heritage or his Hellenistic environment? It is a question which has been much discussed by German and British scholars in the last three or four decades. There was a time when Reitzenstein, Bousset and Co. almost persuaded scholars, abroad at any rate, that Paul had turned the simple idyll of Galilee (which we were told was the original Gospel of Jesus) into a cosmic drama of redemption patterned on the model of the Greek mystery religions. British scholarship was not so easily persuaded of the truth of this theory: it clung to the view that though Paul borrowed terms and ideas here and there from his Greek world, he remained *au fond* a Jew. Now the tide has definitely set in the direction which they were persuaded was the right one. The latest evidence of this is a large book entitled *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (S.P.C.K.; 27s. 6d. net).

The author is Mr. W. D. Davies, recently appointed to the Chair of New Testament Studies in the United College, Bradford. The thesis of this notable first book is succinctly stated in the Preface: 'The work is an attempt to set certain pivotal aspects of Paul's life and thought against the background of the contemporary Rabbinic Judaism, so as to reveal how, despite his Apostleship to the Gentiles, he remained, as far as possible, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and baptized his Rabbinic heritage into Christ.'

The aim then is to show that the roots of Paul's salient doctrines are to be sought not in Greek but in Rabbinic sources. And how thoroughly Professor Davies sets about his task! After an opening chapter on Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism, he proceeds to a discussion of such themes as the Flesh and Sin, the First and the Second Adam, Paul's Nationalism and Universalism, Paul as Preacher and Teacher of the Individual, Christ the Wisdom of God, the Lord the Spirit, the Death of Jesus and the Resurrection. In the result the book becomes a theology of St. Paul whose Jewish antecedents are established beyond cavil. Now it is Paul's doctrine of the flesh, now his conception of the two Adams, now his mysticism which is shown to be utterly Hebraic in origin. Professor Davies is obviously abreast of all the latest work in the Pauline field; he can quote chapter and verse from *Pirkē Aboth* or Philo; he has read—and can criticize cogently—such books as Goodenough's 'By Light, Light'; and he writes as one who loves the Apostle Paul 'only this side idolatry.' And though some of his conclusions seem to us speculative, we have not the slightest doubt that he has made out his case.

Here, then, for the Paulinist, is good matter, lovingly set forth. Each assertion is well documented and attested. The style is clear and readable, and Professor Davies can coin a phrase which sets the whole matter in a modern perspective (for example, 'a kind of first-century Vansittartism which condemned the Gentiles lock, stock and barrel'). This is hardly a book for the hard-pressed minister in quest of material for sermons, but it is, most emphatically, a first-rate contribution to the understanding of St. Paul. The pity is that it costs so much. If its three hundred and seventy-six closely packed pages could be compressed into, say, a hundred pages with a short summary of the argument to introduce each chapter, it would be a boon and a blessing to the working minister who wants to keep his Pauline studies bright. As it is, Professor Davies has made a very auspicious *début* as a *Neutestamentler*; he has written a notable book on St. Paul; and we look with expectancy for further books of the same quality from his pen.

A. M. HUNTER.

THE JEWISH NEW YEAR FESTIVAL.

How far back can the association of the Jewish New Year Festival (*Rosh hashShanah*) with the doctrine of God as King be traced? This is the question which Professor Norman H. Snaith, M.A., of Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds, sets himself to answer in *The Jewish New Year Festival: Its Origins and Development* (S.P.C.K.; 13s. 6d. net).

As is well known, the brilliant Norwegian scholar, Sigmund Mowinckel, conjectured (in *Psalmenstudien II* [1922]) that in pre-exilic Israel there was, every New Year's Day, a festival of the accession of Yahweh to his kingly throne, during the course of which there was a dramatic representation in which the Ark was carried in procession up to the Temple, and in which the reigning king played the part of the God. Such pretentions to 'divine kingship' by the earthly monarch, assuming that they were ever made, must have been blasphemous to the Jews of post-exilic times, who accordingly tried to expunge all traces of them. Mowinckel based his thesis largely upon a group of Psalms which included the *Venite*,

which, he argued, were pre-exilic, and which he interpreted in the light of the Babylonian *akitu* festival.

That the existence of such a cult in the official religion of pre-exilic Israel should shock our orthodox susceptibilities is not to say that Mowinckel's thesis is wrong. It is entirely a question of the sufficiency or otherwise of the historical evidence, and there is plenty of evidence that heathenish practices were carried on, even in the Temple, right down to the Exile. Moreover, Mowinckel's general contention has been powerfully reinforced by the evidence from Ras Shamra, so that many who were sceptical about his original thesis are now disposed to admit that what has been called the myth and ritual pattern of the Ancient East did in fact strongly influence Hebrew religion in the period of the monarchy.

Professor Snaith, whose evidences are drawn largely from post-Old Testament times, as embodied in the Mishnah, Tosefta, and Talmuds, finds that the association of *Rosh hashShanah* with the Kingdom of God is not earlier than the second century A.D. During the period of the second Temple the dominant motif at *Rosh hashShanah* was that of penitence. What, then, of pre-exilic times? Professor Snaith's answer is, 'What other ceremonies were observed at the feast of the turn of the year in Old Israel we do not know for certain. We can but guess.' Very well, Mowinckel was 'guessing,' on the analogy of Babylonian ceremonies. To this Professor Snaith replies, 'It is probable that the parallels to whatever cult-rites may have existed throughout pre-exilic Israel . . . were more after the pattern of what has recently been found at Ras Shamra than after the pattern of what we have hitherto known from Babylonia.' But is not the disjunctive, Babylonia *or* Ras Shamra, false? Mowinckel, when he put forward his theory in 1922, had perforce to appeal to Babylonia, because no one had yet heard of Ras Shamra. Of course, Babylonian cults were urbanized, as Professor Snaith insists, and conditions in Palestine, both geographically and culturally, were nearer to those of Ras Shamra than they were to those of Babylonia. Mowinckel knows this well enough, and no more than anyone else would he now appeal only to Babylonia. But the cults in Ras Shamra and Babylonia were only variants, according to local conditions, of one basic pattern, and it looks as if Professor Snaith, when he so strongly criticizes Mowinckel's original thesis, is being needlessly polemical. We are still 'guessing,' as Professor Snaith agrees that we must; but it was a brilliant guess by Mowinckel that started a discussion which in any case could not long have been deferred. This is not to disparage Professor Snaith's book, which assembles a wealth of unfamiliar material and presents it in the original and provocative way we have come to expect of its author.

C. R. NORTH.

The Call to Worship (Carey Press; 5s. net), by the Rev. David Tait Patterson, is a revised and enlarged edition of a work first published in 1930. It is described on the sub-title as 'A Book of Services for the help and guidance of those who minister in the House of God.' Part I. consists of sentences of Scripture for use as an introduction to worship, Part II. of some of the great Catholic prayers of the Church, and Part III. of ordinances and offices of the Church. The music in the first part (for the people's responses) has been selected and arranged by Sir George Dyson, Mus.Doc. (Oxon.). A new feature of this fourth edition is an Order for the Visitation of the Sick. Obviously the book has been found useful and should continue to be so. Especially useful are the sentences and prayers relevant to the occasions of the Christian Year. Our readers will have observed that the publishers are the Carey Press; accordingly they will not look in this Service-book for an Order for the Baptism of Infants.

In *The Dawn Breaks* (Carey Press; 5s. net) Mr. W. D. Grenfell has given us one of the most interesting missionary books we have read for some time. He adopts the device of making a lump of clay vocal and this brick, or whatever it is, gives quite fascinating descriptions of what native life in the Congo was like before the gospel touched it, and of the wonderful transformation wrought within a short time. The book is packed full of items which the anthropologist will welcome; old traditional native customs relative to birth, marriage, death, and trade, the dreadful tyranny of the witch-doctor, and many other points are clearly set forth. The Christian will find this story of the light-and-life-and-hope-bringing gospel a veritable tonic.

There have been many accounts published of the experiences of prisoners in Japanese internment camps but a book just published, *Through Toil and Tribulation* (Carey Press; 6s. net) has a special interest as giving separate stories of twenty-three Baptist missionaries interned in China. While there are inevitable repetitions in these accounts due to the fact that in a number of cases the same camp is described from different points of view, yet the cumulative effect of their testimony is impressive, especially as they speak for eighteen children as well as for themselves. Perhaps the narrowest escape was that of a mother and three children in a camp near Manila. How General MacArthur's parachute troops came to their rescue when many in the camp were dying of starvation and disease is told—as all the stories are—with a quiet fortitude which trust in God's care alone can create. This is a heartening record and should be read.

When the Song Began, by Mr. George E. Hicks (Carey Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a brief account of some aspects of the author's work as a missionary in Gaya in Bihar. This place, from its association with Buddha, is, as Mr. Hicks says, 'a strong bastion in the very heart of Hinduism and Buddhism.' It cannot be an easy place in which to proclaim the Christian message. But there

were other reasons as well why Gaya needed this message. Not only are there always pilgrims there, but there are also lepers and there are Doms. 'Lepers,' says Sir John Whitty who, as Governor of Bihar, invited Mr. Hicks to take charge of the Leper Home in Gaya, 'in their hundreds came there' to seek alms from the pilgrims. And Doms are, in the Hindu view, the scum of the earth. It is especially of his work among those two classes of desperately needy people that Mr. Hicks writes. This is a story, as Sir John Whitty in his Foreword says, 'of good work well done.' *The Song* is a song of deliverance from the darkest shadows that life brings.

The Rector of Tolleshunt Knights, Dr. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D., who wields a practised theological pen, enters into the lists against Rome with a volume entitled, *Transubstantiation* (Church Book Room Press; 6s. net). The sub-title is, 'The Roman Dogma Examined.' It is an examination at once scholarly and searching to which the dogma is here subjected. The fundamental criticism is that the dogma 'is founded on an obsolete and discarded theory of substance, matter and bodies, namely, that there is some intangible, invisible essence in which the qualities, or properties, visible and tangible, which are called "accidents," reside or cohere.' It is further argued that even if transubstantiation in the Roman sense were possible not a few consequences would follow to which there are serious objections. The Scriptural basis of the dogma is carefully examined, also the testimony of Fathers and Schoolmen, not to speak of the support given to the dogma in Canon Law and in modern explanations. Of course Roman controversialists are familiar with the critical positions here put forward.

In the series of 'Modern Christian Revolutionaries' a brief life of *Sören Kierkegaard* has appeared, written by a devoted disciple, Mr. Melville Chaning-Pearce (James Clarke; 4s. 6d. net). A sketch is offered of the philosopher's life, but most of the little book is taken up with an exposition of his system of thought. This is summed up in the phrase 'existential thinking.' What that is has been described by Professor Karl Heim: 'A proposition or truth is said to be existential when I cannot apprehend or assent to it from the standpoint of a mere spectator but only on the ground of my total existence.' Truth is not grasped by the intellect but by the emotions. There is only one proof of the truth of Christianity, Kierkegaard wrote, 'and that, quite rightly, is from the emotions, when the dread of sin and a heavy conscience torture a man into crossing the narrow line between despair bordering on madness and Christianity. *There* lies Christianity.' 'There, in any case,' says his biographer, 'lay Christianity for Kierkegaard.' This is far from being a cheerful book, for its subject was a very tragic person, but the author has put a great deal of exposition into his restricted space.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of December 1946 an extremely appreciative review of *How Heathen is Britain?* (Collins; 3s. 6d. net), by Mr. B. G. Sandhurst, appeared. The book has made a deep impression on the public and four editions have been called for. In view of this the author has greatly enlarged his material, so that the book has become double its original size. A well-known youth leader, Lord Rowallan, says of the first edition: 'It is one of the most startling books I have ever read,' and it may be recalled that Mr. C. S. Lewis expressed his profound admiration in a Preface to the original book. In its extended form its usefulness will be greatly increased. It is a very simple and sincere account of how the author has dealt with the perplexities, and especially the ignorance, of young people of the later adolescent age. It is good that the price has been kept low so that almost anyone can afford to buy a copy.

From the Hillside (Independent Press; 5s. net), by the Rev. Gaius Glenn Atkins, D.D., is a study in the Sermon on the Mount by a well-known American preacher and author. It has been selected as a Lenten devotional book for Congregationalists in the United States and Great Britain; for whom in respect of Lenten literature authorship now does a 'shuttle service' across the Atlantic year by year. The book is intended by the author to be a companion volume to a series of meditations on 'The Seven Last Words' which was published under the title, 'From the Cross'; and it is suggested that the two books between them might in their way interpret Christianity both as ethics and as redemption. In the book before us the expositions are in a clear and thoughtful style, and the author keeps his eye upon problems and difficulties of the present age. He is surely right in saying it was an instinct which lay deeper than reason that led Christian faith and devotion to centre from the first around the Cross rather than the Hillside; yet the Cross and the Hillside are one and inseparable. Redemption needs the Christian ethic for its completion.

The Rev. Canon Spencer Leeson, M.A., the author of the recent Bampton Lectures for 1944 on 'Christian Education,' recently reviewed in these columns, has followed it up with a volume dealing with some of the problems of education in practice—*The Public Schools Question, and Other Essays on Subjects connected with Secondary Education* (Longmans; 8s. 6d. net). Canon Leeson was formerly Headmaster of Winchester College, and knows his subject from A to Z. He also writes in a light and graceful style, and when authority combines with brightness the result is attractive. The author has made his argument easy to follow on the Public Schools question and the place of the Grammar School in the educational system by prefacing what he says with a chronology of facts and a useful 'summary of contents.' But the part of the book which will appeal specially to the general reader is that which

occupies the last two lectures, one on the proper method of teaching classics and history in a sixth form, and the other on 'Christianity and Boys,' a convincing and stimulating defence of religious education to young adolescents, a charming piece of genial controversial writing. The whole book is worth careful attention by anyone interested in both education and religion and, in addition, is a pleasure to read.

To the Romans, by the Rev. Canon Ernest Evans, D.D., of Bradford (Mowbray; 10s. 6d. net), is a popular and very readable exposition of the Epistle. Written in the conviction that 'it is more profitable to know where a train is going than where it comes from,' it sets out in fourteen chapters the main themes of the Letter and shows their relevance to present-day trends in thought and conduct. This is the chief value of the book, and it is admirably done. Particularly good are the chapters on Abraham and on the Christian Life. The details of exegesis are not neglected; and while admitting that the meaning of the original is at times obscure, Dr. Evans often suggests new interpretations, for example, of 'the spirit of holiness' (1^4) and the 'oracles of God' (3^2). There are also many vivid renderings and interesting illustrations. The keywords of the Epistle are well discussed, but it is not a little disappointing to find 'propitiation' taken in its classical, not Biblical, sense, and 'repentance' defined as 'change of mind'—this last, however, is later qualified. Dr. Evans is a strong believer in the Second Coming, and this may account for his strange neglect of Dodd's work on the Epistle. But in the main this is a sound and stimulating book.

The Religious Education Press, to which we owe a debt for many helpful books, has acted on an original suggestion in three recent publications. It was to tell the story of religion in England round the personalities of the men who made it. The little books are entitled *How Christianity Came to England, How Christianity Grew in England, How Christianity Spread in England*, all by the Rev. Ronald W. Thomson (2s. 6d. net each volume). The first volume begins with Alban, Patrick, and Columba, and ends with Bede and Alfred. The second begins with Becket and Wycliffe and ends with Herbert and Fox. The third begins with Wesley and Whitefield and ends with Livingstone and Booth. All the books are amply illustrated and the whole scheme is admirably calculated to tell the great story in a way that will arrest, interest, and enlighten the youthful readers.

Jonathan Edwards' View of Man (Religious Education Press; 2s. 6d. net) is a study in eighteenth-century Calvinism by the Rev. A. B. Crabtree, B.A., B.D. It was presented as a thesis to the Theological Faculty at Zürich, and on the strength of it the author was awarded a Doctorate. It is a useful, well-written conspectus of the New England theologian's doctrine concerning man and sin, with an appraisal of Edwards both as a preacher and as a theologian. Mr. Crabtree enjoyed at Zürich the privilege of guidance in his studies by Dr. Emil Brunner.

Religious Liberty, by the Rev. Cecil Northcott (S.C.M.; 6s. net), is a brief but satisfactory handling of a complex theme. Part of the merit of the book is its showing just how complex the subject is. It deals in five chapters with: what is religious liberty?, religious liberty in history, Christianity and religious liberty, a survey of religious liberty to-day, and, finally, a plan for liberty. The fourth chapter is naturally by far the longest and seems to us of as great value as interest. We all know that the record of no Church as regards liberty to dissent has been historically quite clean and that down to the eighteenth century no Church in power regarded toleration as anything but sinful. The author in discussing that shows at once full knowledge of the facts and clear perception of what the struggle for liberty involved, for his conviction is that religious freedom is the fundamental human freedom. This freedom, he argues, involves two things—(*a*) the right of the individual to approach God directly, freedom of conscience and free choice of religious fellowship; (*b*) the right of a religious community to order its own way of life and to witness to its beliefs. And this freedom ought to be acknowledged and safeguarded by the State.

A lovely edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress* has been published by the S.C.M. (12s. 6d. net). It has a brief but sufficient Introduction by Dr. Hugh Martin, and a large number of illustrations, some full page and others inserted in the text, by Clarke Hutton. The word 'lovely' is not too strong in praise of the beautiful print and the choice blue colour of the binding. Editor, artist, and typographer have collaborated to produce what must be one of the choicest editions of the immortal classic which exist. A special word of appreciation must be added for the illustrations which are individual and dramatic. It was enterprising of the S.C.M. to issue such a book, and it is to be hoped that their courage will be rewarded by a large circulation.

The Church of Our Fathers, by Mr. Roland H. Bainton (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net), is a well-written outline of the history of the Church from the earliest times to the present day, designed for young readers. It is richly illustrated with reproductions of Christian art contemporary—or as near that as can be—with the events described. Obviously such a book can deal with so vast a field in no more than two hundred and forty-eight pages only by careful selection of topics. That, however, has been admirably done; and the really decisive points of ecclesiastical history are presented in fitting proportion, and presented accurately. Like all the best books for young readers, this one will be read with pleasure and profit by older folks too.

Isaac Watts.

By Professor Norman V. Hope, B.D., Ph.D., Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.

In any account of the development of the English hymn, the name of Isaac Watts must occupy a place of high honour. To be sure, it would doubtless be correct to say that the very greatest of all English hymn-writers was not Watts but Charles Wesley. But even so, it may well be thought that Watts' over-all contribution to English hymnody was at least as great as that of any other, Wesley included.

The chief facts concerning the life of Isaac Watts can be briefly summarized. He was born in Southampton, England, in 1674, the son of a Dissenting schoolmaster who later went into business. Since during the reign of King Charles II (1660–85) Nonconformity was penalized by law in England, Watts' father—like such other Dissenters as John Bunyan—more than once went to prison for his religious convictions. Young Watts received his early education at the Grammar School of his native town, which he attended from 1680 till 1690. At that time—and indeed down to the nineteenth century—Nonconformists were debarred from the two English Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Accordingly, Watts pursued his higher studies at the Dissenting Academy at Stoke Newington, London, between 1690 and 1694. As the late Bernard L. Manning has pointed out, such academies as the one at which Watts studied had at least one notable advantage over the older Universities at that time, inasmuch as they developed a wider conception of education, in which not only mathematics and classics, but also philosophy, natural science, history, and modern languages found a place. Thus Watts was enabled to lay the foundations of a wide and varied scholarship.

After leaving the Academy Watts spent the next two years at home in Southampton. In 1696 he became tutor to the family of Sir John Hartopp, a well-known London Nonconformist, with whom he remained until 1702. Between 1699 and 1702 Watts acted as part-time assistant to the Rev. Dr. Isaac Chauncey, minister of the important Independent (*i.e.* Congregational) Chapel in Mark Lane, London, of which Hartopp was a member; and in the latter year he was installed as sole pastor. Ill-health, however, dogged his footsteps almost from the very outset of his ministry. As early as 1703 Watts was obliged to seek pulpit assistance from the Rev. Samuel Price, who in 1713 was given the official status of co-pastor. So deeply entrenched was Watts, however, in the loyalty and affection of his people, that he was not allowed to sever his official connexion with the congregation, of which he remained senior minister all the rest of his life. About this time—the exact date is not quite certain, but it must have been between 1712 and 1714—Watts accepted the invitation of a wealthy friend, Sir Thomas Abney by name, to live in his (Abney's) home, first in the country at Theobalds, in Hertfordshire, and then at Stoke Newington, London; and in the Abney home he remained as an honoured guest until his death in November, 1748.

Watts never married. So far as is known, the only lady to whom he ever proposed was a Miss Elizabeth Singer, afterwards Mrs. Thomas Rowe. Miss Singer, who was something of a poetess herself, had been greatly attracted by Watts' writings. But when the two of them met, though Watts fell strongly in love with her, she was so disappointed by his ungainly and unprepossessing appearance that she declined to be his wife, adding—not perhaps very tactfully or graciously—'Mr. Watts, I only wish I could say that I admire the casket as much as I admire the jewel.' Thereafter Watts, while retaining this lady's staunch friendship to the end of her life, remained a bachelor.

Though he was never in robust health, Watts managed to crowd into his life a large volume of literary activity. Thus (I) he wrote educational treatises, of which the most important were (*a*) his *Logic, or the Right Use of Reason in the Enquiry after Truth* [1724], which was for many years used as a text-book at Oxford University and other educational institutions; and (*b*) his *Knowledge of the Heavens and the Earth Made Easy* [1725].

(II) Watts composed several works of controversial divinity, such as *The Christian Doctrine of the Trinity* [1722], *Dissertations Relating to the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity* [1725], and *Useful and Important Questions Concerning Jesus the Son of God* [1746]. Some of his theological writings caused him to be accused of Arian heresy, *i.e.*, denial of the full and essential deity of Jesus Christ, but without sufficient justification.

(III) Watts' poetical volume, *Horae Lyricae: Poems Chiefly of the Lyric Kind*, published in 1705, caused Dr. Samuel Johnson, the eminent eighteenth-century literary critic, to include Watts in his famous *Lives of the Poets* [1781], which has

been described as 'perhaps the greatest body of critical opinion in the English language.' There Dr. Johnson appraises Watts' poetry thus: 'As a poet, had he been only a poet, he would probably have stood high among the authors with whom he is now associated. For his judgment was exact, and he noted beauties and faults with very nice discernment; his imagination as the "Dacian Battle" proves, was vigorous and effective, and the stores of knowledge were large by which his fancy was to be supplied. His ear was well-tuned, and his diction was elegant and copious; but his devotional poetry is, like that of others, unsatisfactory. The paucity of its topics enforces perpetual repetition, and the sanctity of the matter rejects the ornaments of figurative diction. It is sufficient for Watts to have done better than others what no man has done well.' This volume of Watts' poems, it may be noted, after running through many editions, was re-issued in 1834 in a series of *Sacred Classics*, with a memoir of the author by Robert Southey, the then Poet-Laureate of Great Britain.

But unquestionably Watts' sacred songs are his greatest literary as well as religious achievement; and it is by them that he will always be remembered. It appears that he began to compose hymns in the following circumstances. One Sunday, in or about the year 1695, Watts, returning home from the Independent service—he was then living with his parents at Southampton—complained about the uncouthness of the psalms which had been sung, declaring them to be lacking in both beauty and dignity. 'Try then,' said his father, 'whether you can produce something better.' Taking up this challenge, young Watts bent his energies to the task, and in due course produced the well-known hymn whose first three verses run thus:

Behold the glories of the Lamb
Amidst His Father's throne;
Prepare new honours for His name,
And songs before unknown.

Let elders worship at His feet;
The Church adores around,
With vials full of odours sweet,
And harps of sweeter sound;

These are the prayers of the saints,
And these the hymns they raise;
Jesus is kind to their complaints,
He loves to hear our praise.

This was the beginning of a prolific career of hymn-writing. Watts' hymns, numbering around seven hundred and fifty in all, were scattered in the pages of seven different works: *Horae Lyricae* [1705; 2nd ed. 1709]. *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* [1707; 2nd ed. 1709]. *Divine and Moral Songs* [1715]. *Psalms of David* [1719]. *Sermons* [1721–27]. *Reliquiae Juveniles* [1734]. *Remnants of Time* [1736]. But it is not unfair to say that the best of his hymns were written by 1719; thereafter, though he continued to compose and to publish his inspiration seemed to falter and fail.

How are Watts' hymns to be characterized? They deal with the central themes of the Christian faith, from that strictly Calvinistic point of view in which he was brought up and in which he sincerely believed. They emphasize the brevity, weakness, and general unsatisfactoriness of human life apart from God, as in the verse:

How vain are all things here below,
How false, and yet how fair!
Each pleasure hath its poison too,
And every sweet a snare.

They dwell upon the glory of Jesus Christ's incarnation, death, resurrection, ascension, and present intercession, as in the lines:

Jesus, my Great High Priest,
Offered His blood and died;
My guilty conscience seeks
No sacrifice beside;
His powerful blood did once atone,
And now it pleads before the throne.

And they picture the fate of the lost in fearsome terms, as in the stanza:

There is a dreadful hell,
And everlasting pains;
Where sinners must with devils dwell
In dungeons, fire, and chains.

As might be expected in an author so prolific, the hymns of Watts are of uneven poetical quality. He can be appallingly, almost incredibly, prosaic and can write sheer doggerel, as in such lines as these:

Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
For God hath made them so;
Let bears and lions growl and fight,
For 'tis their nature to;

or

Birds in their little nests agree,
And 'tis a shameful sight
When children of one family
Fall out, and chide, and fight;

or

The tulip and the butterfly
Appear in gayer coats than I;
Let me be drest fine as I will,
Flies, worms, and flowers exceed me still.

In some cases Watts does not manage his rhymes very gracefully—in this matter comparing

unfavourably with Charles Wesley. Thus, he writes :

> Not all the outward forms on earth,
> Nor rites that God has given,
> Nor will of man, nor blood, nor birth,
> Can raise the soul to heaven.
>
> The sovereign will of God alone,
> Creates us heirs of grace.
> Born in the image of His Son,
> A new peculiar race.

But when every defect in Watts' hymns has been freely admitted, it remains true that he rendered three outstanding services to English hymnody.

(I) He, more than any one else, created for the singing of hymns that place which it has always subsequently retained in English services of public worship. Lord Selborne has called Watts ' the father of English hymnody ' ; and Bernard L. Manning has said that ' to Watts more than any other man, is due the triumph of the hymn in English worship. All later hymn-writers, even when they excel him, are his debtors.'

Among the Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century there were two quite contrasted views concerning the propriety of singing hymns ' of human composition ' at Christian public worship. On the one hand, Martin Luther, influenced by his love for German folk-song and his regard for the Latin hymns of the Catholic Church, strongly favoured the singing of vernacular hymns by worshipping congregations. He not only composed thirty-seven hymns himself—the most famous of which, of course, is *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*—but he began a tradition of hymn composition in the Lutheran Church which found worthy expression in hymnists like Paul Gerhardt [1607–1676].

John Calvin, on the other hand, disgusted with the frivolity of contemporary French song, averse to everything which savoured of Romanism, and hostile to anything which might seem to detract from the paramount authority of Holy Scripture, from the outset of his ministry in Geneva set his face against the introduction of ' human hymns.' All that he would permit for use in congregational praise were metrical versions of Bible passages, particularly the Psalms.

Under the influence of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, England at the Reformation followed the Calvinistic pattern of public praise, as Scotland did under John Knox and Andrew Melville. From the Reformation down to the end of the seventeenth century, the staple of public praise in England, both in Anglican and Nonconformist churches, consisted of metrical psalms. Of these the most widely used version was that of Sternhold and Hopkins, which, issued in 1561–62, achieved such widespread popularity as to acquire something of the character of ' an almost authorized psalm book.' This ' Old Version,' as it came to be called, left much to be desired from the literary point of view. Indeed, one authority says that ' for literary use, it must be confessed to be almost dead. The likeness to the Hebrew is that of the corpse to the living body.' And another critic, hearing a parish clerk sing these psalms, expressed his views in the following epigram :

> Sternhold and Hopkins had great qualms,
> When they translated David's psalms,
> To make the heart right glad ;
> But had it been King David's fate,
> To hear thee sing and them translate,
> By ——, 'twould set him mad.

As can readily be imagined, under those circumstances congregational praise was in a parlous state. Isaac Watts, in the preface to his *Hymns* in 1707, described the situation—probably without much exaggeration—thus : ' While we sing the praises of God in His Church we are employed in that part of worship which of all others is nearest akin to heaven ; and it is a pity that this should be performed the worst upon earth. To see the dull indifference, the neglect, and the thoughtless air that sits upon the faces of a whole assembly while the Psalm is on their lips, might tempt even a charitable observer to suspect the fervency of inward religion.' ' Many ministers and private Christians,' he goes on to say, ' have long groaned under this inconvenience. At their importunate and repeated requests I have for some years devoted many hours of leisure to this service.'

To be sure, even before Watts' day some attempts had been made to remedy this deplorable state of affairs. Thus, in 1696 Messrs. Tate and Brady issued their ' New Version ' of the Psalms ; but this, though employed in the London area, did not supersede the ' Old Version ' on any large scale. Other portions of Scripture, besides the Psalms, were turned into verse ; for example, in 1623 George Wither published his *Hymns and Songs of the Church*, the first part of which consisted of Bible paraphrases. Even original hymns, which made no pretence of being based upon any particular passage of Scripture, were written and published in the seventeenth century ; for instance, Bishop Thomas Ken [1637–1711] in 1674 published a *Manual of Prayers for the Use of the Scholars of Winchester College*, that school with which he was associated. This *Manual* contained the injunction, ' Be sure to say the Morning and Evening Hymn in your chamber devoutly.' Though Ken's Morning and Evening hymns were not included in his *Manual* until 1694, it seems certain that they were in use not long after the Restoration of 1660. Watts himself, in the Preface to his *Hymns* of 1707,

declared that some ministers had already begun to use 'evangelical hymns.' But, until Watts published his hymns, the employment of such compositions in public worship in England was very much the exception and not the rule. The late Dr. Louis F. Benson was quite right in affirming that 'there was no English Hymnody in any effective sense until the eighteenth century' (*The English Hymn*, 21). The main begetter of this Hymnody was Isaac Watts.

Though it would hardly be correct to say that Watts' hymns achieved universal acclaim overnight, before many years had passed their excellence, both from the religious and the literary point of view, won for them widespread recognition and use. In 1744 Dr. Philip Doddridge could write thus to his friend Watts: 'I congratulate you that by your sacred poetry, especially by your Psalms and your Hymns, you are leading the worship and I trust animating the devotion of myriads in our public assemblies every Sabbath, and in their families and closets every day. This, sir, at least so far as it relates to the service of the sanctuary, is an unparalleled favour, by which God hath been pleased to distinguish you, I may boldly say it, beyond any of His servants now upon earth' (quoted by Dr. Louis F. Benson, *The English Hymn*, 124). So strong a hold, indeed, did Watts' hymns take in Independent circles that, as late as the nineteenth century, there were—so it is said—many older Congregationalists who refused to sing any other hymns, and who kept their seats when such were announced! Thus, under Watts' inspiration, hymns secured that place of importance as vehicles of congregational praise which they have ever since enjoyed in services of public worship in England.

(II) Watts, both by his precept and by his example, gave a great impetus to hymn-writing in England. Not merely was he an indefatigable hymn-writer himself, but he also set others to write hymns for public worship, and so follow the trail which he had been so largely instrumental in blazing. The best known of these disciples of Watts is Philip Doddridge [1702–1751], his friend and later contemporary. Doddridge composed, among others, such pieces as the Communion hymn 'My God, and is Thy Table Spread,' and the advent hymn 'Hark the Glad Sound, the Saviour Comes,' besides such other popular hymns as 'Awake my Soul, stretch every Nerve' and 'Ye Servants of the Lord.' Other disciples of Watts in the field of hymn-writing include men like Simon Browne [1680–1732], the author of the hymn 'Come, Holy Spirit, Heavenly Dove,' and 'Lord, at Thy Feet We Sinners Lie'; Thomas Gibbons [1720–1785], one of Watts' biographers, who wrote such hymns as 'Now Let Our Souls On Wings Sublime' and 'Great God, the Nations of the Earth'; and Samuel Medley [1738–1799], the author of 'Come Join Ye Saints with Heart and Voice.' Though doubtless these disciples of Watts are not well known to modern congregations, since very few of their compositions are generally included in recent hymnals, they made quite a significant contribution in their day and generation to the stock of hymns suitable for public praise in Christian churches.

Watts' influence as a hymn-writer extended even to Scotland. For example, Ralph Erskine [1685–1752], one of the members of a group who broke away from the Church of Scotland in 1733 and set up ecclesiastical housekeeping on their own account as the 'Original Secession Church,' published *Scripture Songs* in 1750–1752, in which Watts' hymns were laid under heavy contribution.

(III) Watts composed a number of hymns which no subsequent collection which lays claim to anything like completeness has been able to omit; and some of his compositions are rightly regarded as among the very greatest hymns in the English language.

At his best Watts deals with the greatest themes of Christian experience, of 'ruin, redemption, and regeneration,' with a depth of conviction, a grace and dignity, and a cosmic range and sweep, which few hymn-writers have ever equalled, much less surpassed. Obvious examples of such hymns—which are, of course, included in every modern anthology—are, 'O God, Our Help in Ages Past,' 'There is a Land of Pure Delight,' 'Come We That Love the Lord,' 'Before Jehovah's Awful Throne,' 'Blest Morning, Whose First Dawning Rays,' 'Come Let Us Join Our Cheerful Songs,' 'I'm Not Ashamed to Own My Lord,' and 'Jesus Shall Reign Where'er the Sun'—a remarkable hymn, considering that it was written long before the beginning of the great modern Missionary Movement in the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth. Above all, Watts wrote 'When I Survey the Wondrous Cross.' In the *Life of John Watson*, by Sir William Robertson Nicoll, it is recorded that Matthew Arnold, the eminent English literary critic, on the last day of his life in 1888 attended morning service in the Sefton Park Presbyterian Church, Liverpool, England, in which his brother-in-law, with whom he was staying at the time, was a regular worshipper. The minister of the church, Dr. John Watson, preached a sermon on 'The Cross of Christ'; and one of the hymns sung during the service was 'When I Survey the Wondrous Cross.' Arnold, when he reached his brother-in-law's home after church, repeated the lines of Watts' hymn, declaring it to be the finest in the English language. Such commendation is praise indeed, coming as it

does from Arnold, a critic of fastidious literary taste, who, moreover, had no particular sympathy with English Dissent.

In view of these massive achievements of Watts, it is not surprising that he has been hailed as one of the greatest benefactors of English Hymnody. And in this age, which delights to remember and to celebrate significant anniversaries, the bicentenary of his death ought not to go unnoticed or unrecognized by those who believe in the importance of worthy public praise in the Christian Church.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Seeking for Butterflies.

By the Reverend J. Clifford Mitchell, Bispham.

'Seek, and ye shall find . . .'—Mt 7^7.

A few weeks ago there died a man—Dr. A. S. Corbet—who spent his life hunting butterflies. He went seeking for them in all parts of the world. Many years were spent tracking through Malayan jungles, where he netted a very wonderful collection of several thousand butterflies, different in size and so marvellous in colour. When he died he was seeking for butterflies in Bramley. You might say, this is a strange thing to do, spending days and weeks and years seeking for butterflies, but Dr. Corbet loved this kind of work, and when he found a rare specimen he felt like shouting for joy.

People have spent a great deal of time seeking for all sorts of things. There is one famous name in history—Columbus. He spent his time looking for a continent. He was quite sure there was a continent to be found. The people to whom he talked about his seeking laughed at him, and said, 'It is just silly, talking about trying to find a continent.' But Columbus went on with his talking, and one day he set out to find what he was quite sure could be found—a continent, and he found it. To-day we know it as America.

A few days ago I was sitting on a pebbly beach when along came a small boy who was seeking for something among the pebbles. 'Lost something, son?' I said to him. 'Yes,' he answered, 'an hour ago when running along the beach I stumbled and fell, and a two shilling piece must have fallen out of my pocket.' As he searched among the pebbles I thought there was not much chance of finding his two shilling piece. He had set his mind on finding it, and after twenty minutes of earnest seeking he had the joy of finding it.

A few years ago a small boy was lost among the Welsh hills, and a thousand men spent a whole day in seeking for him. He was not the only boy in the family, there were two others, but this one little chap was lost, and it was important that he should be found, so hundreds of men spent hours and hours seeking for him.

The New Testament has a great deal to say about 'seeking.' 'Which of you,' said Jesus, 'with a hundred sheep, if he loses one, does not leave the ninety and nine in the desert and go after the lost one till he find it?' And again He said, 'Suppose a woman has ten shillings. If she loses one of them, does she not light a lamp and scour the house and search carefully till she finds it?' 'Seek, and ye shall find,' said Jesus. Seeking means persistence. Dr. Corbet found rare butterflies because he was persistent, so keen that he travelled to different parts of the world. The boy who lost his two shilling piece was persistent. He kept on seeking for it till he found it. When Jesus used the word 'seek' He meant that we have to be persistent in our efforts to understand His truth, what He said about God and His purpose. The wealth of His love, His truth and His goodness are to be found, but not unless we seek for them with all our heart and mind and soul. Seek! Seek! And ye shall find the wisdom of God. To possess His wisdom, to understand His love and possess it, is the most precious of possessions.

The Sun in the Morning.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'A pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun.'—Ec 11^7.

At the moment in London there's a popular American play. *Annie Get your Gun* is the unusual title of it. Annie was an American girl, a prairie girl. She became a member of a famous show, 'Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show,' and she was a most amazing shot with a gun. Once, for example, in Germany, she shot a cigarette clean out of the mouth of the German Emperor without hurting him. This play about her has some most attractive songs. Maybe you've listened in to some of them. The words of such songs are sometimes silly, one has to admit. The words of the favourite one, however, are not. It starts like this:

Taking stock of what I have and what I haven't,
What do I find,
The things I've got will keep me satisfied.
Checking up on what I have and what I haven't,
What do I find?
A healthy balance on the credit side.

Then there's the chorus, which concludes like this :

Got no cheque-books, got no banks,
Still I'd like to express my thanks.
I got the sun in the morning and the moon at night;
And with the sun in the morning,
And the moon in the evening,
I'm all right.

In many ways a very sensible sentiment, isn't it ? It's an idea which occurs, too, in an interesting incident in which Caruso, who was one of the world's finest singers, was concerned. Most of his life he lived in America. But one day when in Italy he and his wife were walking on a road above the Bay of Naples when they saw a ragged boy, dirty but beautiful, lying on a low wall. On seeing them the boy sat up, held out a hand, and begged a penny.

'And if,' said the great man, 'I don't give you a penny, what then ?' 'Then, signor,' was his prompt answer, 'I will still have the sun.' They hadn't the power, you see, to deprive him of that.

Strange to say now, years and years ago, a wise and good man gave much the same answer, after he'd fallen into the hands of thieves. They had robbed him of all his money, yet he wrote : 'They have left me the sun and the moon, fire and water, a loving wife, many friends to pity me and some to relieve me. And, unless I list (that is, unless I like it), they have not taken away my merry countenance, and my cheerful spirit and a good conscience.'

A splendid answer, you'll agree, and the proper way to take such things. A lesson, too, for all of us, isn't it, for there are always crowds of things left to be thankful about when you

Count your blessings
And name them one by one.

Health and strength, hearing and sight, happy homes and loved ones and friends, and, not least, the moon and the sun.

The Christian Year.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Way.

BY THE REVEREND J. C. MORTON, CRESWELL, WORKSOP.

'Jesus saith unto him, I am the way.'—Jn 14^{6}.

A few years ago I had the unpleasant experience of being lost in the African bush. I had become a collector of butterflies, and on this occasion had gone into the up country bush with the intention of catching rare specimens. I knew I was not more than a ten-minute walk from the road where I had left my truck, and thought I had carefully noted the path into the bush, but try as I might I could not find my way out. I wandered about for a half-hour or so trying first one path and then another, until with a sigh of relief I came across a native boy to whom I explained my plight. Grinning in typical native fashion, and obviously enjoying my discomfiture he said : 'Masser, I am de way.' He was not, I think, consciously attempting to quote Scripture, nor trying to give himself airs. What he meant was that apart from himself there was no way out of the bush for me. No instructions would do for there were no landmarks. He was the way and I had to entrust myself to him.

That experience is a parable of man in the modern world. If he is not exactly lost there can be no denying that he is in need of guidance and direction. There is a way wherein he may walk, but he cannot walk it alone. He needs the presence of Another who not only knows the way, but is Himself the way.

Now it is precisely this need which Christianity claims to supply. When Jesus uttered the well-known words, 'I am the way,' He was affirming what is the central fact of the Christian faith. Dr. John Mackay in his illuminating little book, *A Preface to Christian Theology*, has put it thus : 'In Christianity everything that has to do with the way is concentrated in a Person.' Now there is nothing novel about this position, nevertheless it is sufficiently interesting to command attention. Let us see what it means. The way of life proclaimed by Christianity is a commitment to a Person—Jesus Christ. The reason for this is that it is in Christ that both God and man find a meeting place.

Now this suggests a twofold activity on the part of Christ. First of all, it is in Christ that God meets man. One of the really great words of the New Testament is the word grace. It means bounty, favour, or kindness, and as such it describes the activity of God. Just as a person out of the kindness of his heart will bestow his favour upon a friend, so God graciously bestows His bounty upon man. But this favour is not the granting of some special boon. It is God Himself coming to man with the object of obtaining his redemption, his deliverance from sin. And this act of redemption is a work of grace. It is an expression of the mercy and favour of God, and it is all revealed in Christ, in His person and work. In Him God meets man and becomes a Saviour.

But Christ is also the object of a man's commitment, or, if you like, of his faith. This is not what has sometimes been described as a blind commitment involving the suspension of judgment and reason. It is a commitment in thought as well as in life. A man takes this step because he comes to the conclusion he can do no other. And a conclusion is usually the climax of a mental process. The reason is that Christ has become not merely the object of a man's faith but the author of it. In other words the Christ he has come to believe in as the way of life is the creator of that belief as well as the object of it. That is why the moral change wrought in a man always carries with it the note of moral certitude. He knows that something has been done for him that he could not do for himself, something that can only be described as a passage from death to life. Here then is the reason why Christianity becomes for a man not a way of life, but the way, the only

way, because it is a radical transformation involving a new attitude to God and man.

Now it is because Christianity makes this demand of personal commitment that it has never been popular. Men do not look with favour upon this idea of surrender to another. So to-day, as of old, they look for another way.

Perhaps the most popular way at the moment is what might be described as a geographical route. It leads both East and West but with different destinations in view. For the last quarter of a century or so men have been looking to the East with its latest experiment in living, and the philosophy of Marx and Engels has become the centre of attraction. At the moment it would seem as if the world were equally divided in its choice, yet neither way offers hope of ultimate salvation.

In addition to this East-West route there is a third, which for the sake of convenience may be described as running North to South, and by way of compromise seeks a middle course. All of them have much to offer, but they are ways and not the way. At best they are geographical routes leading to the natural man's experiment in the art of living, and therefore can guarantee neither finality nor success.

It is perhaps interesting to note something of the pattern these geographical routes make, East, West, North, South. The pattern is cruciform. Treat it as a bit of idle speculation if you like, but don't entirely discard the suggestion behind it. I remember reading somewhere of a historian who drew a plan of the Island of Iona based upon his idea of how it was laid out in St. Columba's time. His plan showed the cruciform of St. Columba's monastery with the main highway in Iona branching off at one point of it. This was how he thought it went. It was nothing more than a conjecture, a guess. But later an architect dug down and found that the road so far from branching off at the cruciform ran right through the centre of it. Which thing is a parable. One day perhaps the world will discover that the whole layout of life is cruciform, which is one reason why it is always going through some measure of crucifixion, and indeed always will do, until ultimately it finds its source of life in that for which the Cross stands.

Another way that has become popular is the acceptance of Christianity as a true philosophy of life as distinct from the idea of commitment to a Person. This way has the advantage of accepting what Christianity has to give without accepting the Giver. It believes in the teaching but not the Teacher. Or as P. T. Forsyth once put it: 'It trusts itself to the type of religion which He represents but it does not trust itself to Him.' In a little book of personal reminiscences entitled *And Another Thing* Mr. Howard Spring, the popular novelist, describes something of his spiritual pilgrimage, and affirms what is his fundamental conviction, that love is the principle of harmony in the world and that without it there can never be anything but chaos. For him love and harmony are one. And then in the following words he describes what he calls his rediscovery of God. He says: 'There was nothing dramatic about it; no sense of a soul being saved, and the more I think of souls and salvation the more I distrust the drama of conversion. Souls, like brains and bodies are apt to mature, if at all, slowly and steadily, by the simple procedure of discovering their right sustenance and keeping to it. No, there was nothing but the calm assurance that these few things were true; that as disaster follows upon disharmony in the world one may assume that the world's principle is harmony; that love and harmony are one; that Jesus was therefore teaching the central truth of life when He told us that the principle of the universe is love.'

Now there is much there with which I find myself in agreement. I distrust much of the so-called drama of conversion, and I believe in the slow growth and maturity of souls. But what Mr. Howard Spring does not see is that that development must lead to an act of commitment if it is to be truly Christian. To assert as he does that Jesus was teaching the central truth of life when He told us that the principle of the universe is love, and that in his own experience there was nothing but the calm assurance that this was true is undoubtedly a step on the way, but it can never be the way until that calm assurance of truth passes into an unshakable conviction born of commitment to a living Person and Lord.

I make no apology for what might seem to be over insistence on a point of detail. As I see it we are at the very nerve centre of Christianity just here, and to claim anything less than this is to cut that nerve and weaken the whole body. Perhaps it is because we have been guilty of this that the Church has lost ground, and men to-day are walking in the way of pagan philosophies with an enthusiasm and devotion that puts much of our Christian discipleship to shame. I ask you therefore in the light of all this to examine the content of your faith. What is Christianity for you? A way of life, or the way, the only way, the final way, apart from which there can never be anything but chaos and darkness? What think ye of Christ? Is He teacher or Lord? Is He an example to be followed or a Master to be served? Is He a moral influence that makes for righteousness, or a Saviour who redeems and makes all things new? We have got to make up our minds about this. In the light of world events this has become the fateful issue of our time. And because I feel there is no way of avoiding this conclusion I should like to close with some words from Dr. P. T. Forsyth written a generation or so ago and still wonderfully relevant. Speaking of his relationship with Christ he says: 'He has possessed me. I am not His loyal subject, but His absolute property. I have rights against King Edward, however loyal I am, but against Christ I have none. He has not merely passed into my life as even a wife may do, but He has given me a new life. . . . There has been what I can only call a new creation, using the strongest word in my reach. I owe Him my total self.' And I submit that nothing short of this will make our faith the living, vital thing it must become

if the world is to be saved from pagan darkness. For Christ must become for us not only the way, but the truth, and the life.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Preaching and Hearing.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.'—1 Co 10[15].

'Christianity is a religion for grown-up people: it is not for children.' These words, or words to the same effect, I once heard uttered by the late Dr. John A. Hutton. Dr. Hutton was given to oracular utterances; but what he meant by that startling statement was pretty much what St. Paul meant when he wrote to the Christians in Corinth, 'I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.' There is nothing of special commendation in his use of the word 'wise' nor, on the other hand, is there anything of sarcasm. The word simply means intelligent or sensible. Hence Dr. Moffatt's version, 'I am speaking to sensible people; weigh my words for yourselves.' Not a childish acceptance of all that he said because it happened to be easy or congenial, nor yet a childish rejection of all that he said because it happened to be difficult or uncongenial, but a patient weighing of his words by an intelligent Christian mind, that is what St. Paul expected of the Corinthian Church, and that is what every Christian preacher and teacher has a right to expect. He says, by implication if not expressly, every time he preaches, 'I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.'

1. This brings a relief to the preacher. The fact that he is speaking to sensible people brings a measure of relief to his overwhelming responsibility. Every preacher is conscious, when he is dealing not perhaps with the very central things of his message but with secondary things, that his discourse is often one-sided. He finds himself stating an aspect of truth which seems appropriate to the situation, while conscious that in different circumstances or to a different audience his duty would be to stress the complementary aspect. Take, for example, those counsels of the New Testament which urge Christians not to be anxious for the morrow, for the Heavenly Father knows and cares. In the Western world, and in this present age especially, there is perhaps no word which we more need to hear than that. It is possible, however, to imagine circumstances in which it would be unwise for the preacher to urge trust in Divine Providence without insisting on the complementary truth that we are called to be fellow-labourers with God. The full truth is gained by an equipoise of partial truths, but the preacher need not hesitate to take the risk of declaring the partial truth, for with his declaration he says in effect, 'I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.'

Again, this relieves the preacher of some of his misgiving lest his message on any particular occasion, while suitable for most of his hearers, may be unsuitable for a few. It is, of course, remarkable how by God's over-ruling there is often a word for us even in a discourse that seems but little addressed to our condition. But imagine a harvest thanksgiving address where the preacher is stressing God's bounty in Nature, and that on a day when there is a family present which has too much cause to remember that there is another side to Nature, a family bereft of friends or possessions by fire or flood or earthquake. Not the revelation of God in Nature but only the revelation of God in Christ can bring comfort to those hearers at that particular time. Yet if there be no word at all in the preacher's discourse which comes home to their hearts, there will surely be something for them in the Scripture lesson, and there will surely be some prayer offered or some word in psalm or hymn which will come home to them—all that, apart from more subtle and inexpressible ways in which the human spirit may be touched by the Divine. But, all that apart, even if the preacher's words be on that occasion quite unprofitable for the hearer, yet still that hearer, being a sensible person, will not petulantly cast aside what he has no use for at the moment, but will note something in the preacher's discourse which may later come home to him and produce fruit of righteousness.

2. This brings a relief to the hearer. The fact that he is a sensible person permits, indeed requires, him to distinguish between the words of the preacher and the Word of God to himself by way of the preacher. The Protestant Church has never been so far left to itself as to suggest that the voice even of its most saintly preachers was equivalent to the voice of God. A sense of humour, not to speak of anything more august, has kept us from that. Even the Pope only claims the unquestioning obedience of the faithful, such obedience as is due to infallible Divine pronouncements, when he speaks *ex cathedra*; and there is some doubt how often, if at all, he has ever done so. All that Protestants claim is that, given a sincere preacher who studies the Scriptures and gives himself to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, there will sound in and through the preacher's words a Word of God which will awaken its response in the heart of the hearer, for in his heart too the Holy Spirit is at work to take of the things of Christ and bring them home with power.

It would be preposterous to suggest that everything said by even the most godly preacher is to be received as the authentic voice of God, but it is not preposterous, it is well attested fact, to assert that in the preacher's message there may be something which, to use Coleridge's word about the Bible, 'finds' the hearer because it is corroborated by the Spirit of God dwelling in him. This relieves the hearer of any degrading servitude to the voice of man. No preacher's presentation of the gospel is without alloy, no preacher's application of the mind of Christ to the complex situations of life is infallible, but then he is speaking to sensible people. If his message does not attest itself as the Word of God then they need not heed

it, in fact they must not heed it. To do so in such circumstances would be to obey man rather than God.

3. This lays a heavy responsibility both on preacher and hearer. There is no encouragement in St. Paul's words either for that type of hearer who comes to be entertained by a speech on a sacred subject or for that type described as 'thrawn commentators sweer to 'gree.' That is not what the Apostle meant by 'judge ye what I say.' St. Paul is speaking to men who need some Word of God to guide them and he urges them to consider whether that word is contained in what he has said on the point. Not an attitude of detached criticism, but an attitude of expectancy, of longing for God's Word to sound in and through the preacher's words and come home with conviction to our hearts—that is what we should bring to preaching. If the preacher has the responsibility of so living that his mind may be inspired by God's Spirit, the hearer has the responsibility of so living that his mind, too, may be open and ready to hear what God may speak. Moreover, it is a serious thing that most of us have heard so much preaching. Have we brought to it that sincerity, that expectancy without which we are not likely to hear an authentic Word of God? Have we perhaps become 'Gospel-hardened,' so that we are now mere sermon-tasters? But a sermon is not to be tasted; it is to be weighed in the presence of God with a view to action.

Finally, remember that our responsibility as we hear preaching is only one aspect of that inclusive responsibility which is ours as creatures to whom God has given a measure of freedom—the responsibility of accepting or rejecting His gracious advances. God Himself will not coerce us into returning to Him and accepting His gracious offer of life in Christ. Even He stands at the door and knocks. He invites, He appeals, He persuades, He warns, He constrains, as if even He in wondrous condescension should address us—'I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.'

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Sympathy.

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR NORMAN SNAITH, M.A., WESLEY COLLEGE, LEEDS.

'In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them.'—Is 63^{9}.

There are three kinds of sympathy. The first is bad, the second is good, the third is Divine. All three can be found amongst men, but which of the three is actually found in any particular man depends on the man, and, especially in respect of the third, on God.

The first. Mr. A—— is hurrying home one evening. He knocks down and runs over a woman under circumstances where it might quite likely be that he was largely to blame. She is patched up and put into plaster. After two or three days he goes to see her, takes her flowers, expresses his sympathy, but is careful to take a male friend with him. He gathers that she is not intending to claim damages. She neither sees nor hears anything more of him. This is one kind of sympathy and it is bad.

The second. Mrs. B—— is in comfortable circumstances, full of good works, socially inclined, and much given to hospitality. She comes to be much concerned about juvenile delinquency in the less salubrious parts of the city. She arranges social events without number, raises a considerable amount of money, and herself heads the list with a substantial donation. Her friend Miss C—— does even better. She opens a youth club with the money which Mrs. B—— has so assiduously collected, and spends the money freely but effectively, all the more effectively because she herself goes and lives there, right amongst her boys and girls, and generally identifies herself, as far as she can, with their frustrations and fears, and their fun and dreams. These two women possess the second kind of sympathy. In each case it is good, though the second is better because it sets forth the true meaning of the word, which is 'suffering with.'

The third kind of sympathy is to be seen on a Cross, the middle one of three. It passes out beyond 'suffering *with*,' and on, a second mile, into 'suffering *for*.' It is the suffering of God, and it is the suffering that saves. Such sympathy is Divine, but men, by the grace of God, can become partakers of it. It is the suffering that saves the world.

It is commonly said that sympathy is born of love. This is precisely true, more precisely and more exactly than is generally realized. The fact is that there is more than one kind of love, and to the same extent more than one kind of sympathy. In English the one word 'love' has to do duty for a whole range of emotions, from the purest to the filthiest. The result is that whilst we are all clear as to the difference between the two extremes, we are not all as precise as we ought to be as to the distinctions to be drawn in between the two extremes. It would be a great assistance to us in making distinct what is at root different if we had three separate words for three distinct types of love. In Greek there are three words, *eros*, *philia*, and *agape*, and these three words correspond exactly to the three types of sympathy previously indicated.

The first. This is the sympathy that is born of *eros*, and it is sympathy wholly for self. *Eros* is self-love, greedy, grasping, and it always 'seeketh its own.' It is the root-cause of all envy, hatred, malice, and uncharitableness. It is the root of sin, for all sin in essence is our insistence upon turning each one our own way, not caring upon whom the burden of our iniquity is laid. Mr. A—— undoubtedly was full of sympathy, but it was sympathy born of *eros*, and he cared nothing for the fact that Mrs. Z—— would never be wholly recovered from the injuries she had sustained. His sympathy was undoubtedly real and sincere, but it was for himself, and when he was satisfied that he himself would suffer no further incon-

venience or pecuniary loss, he ceased to take any interest in the affair. Such sympathy is bad, and it is bad because it is born of *eros*.

The second. This is the sympathy that is born of *philia*, and it is a generous, praiseworthy sentiment which involves a real concern for others. It varies in depth and degree, but at its best it can issue in a devotion that is altogether to be admired. Such brotherly-love is human nature at its best. It is the glory of humankind that even the most selfish are on occasion capable of it, both the drunken sot in the slum who beats his wife, and the successful isolationist in the suburbs who loads his wife with furs. Such brotherly-love has nothing to do with any kind of religion, though it is more common where Christianity has some kind of influence, however second-hand or remote. It belongs to all men and is held to be good and desirable by all who have brains and use them, and by all who have hearts which are not wholly ossified by *eros*. Mrs. B—— was motivated by *philia*, and her sympathy was real and sincere. It was good, because she had a real concern for the welfare of the youngsters in the lower part of the town. Perhaps her circumstances would allow her to do no more than she did, but Miss C—— did better. She sought to identify herself with them; to suffer with them, and in so doing brought herself over the middle line of partition between *eros* and *agape*. She changed 'being sorry for' into something of the nature of 'suffering with.' Both are good, but neither is good enough. Such sympathy tends to be limited by class, colour, race, and only occasionally overleaps such barriers. This is why so many men and women 'of goodwill,' in spite of all their altruism, are full of class prejudice and race prejudice, and this from both sides of the fence, from the unprivileged side as well as from the privileged side. *Philia* is good, but it is not good enough.

The third. This is the sympathy that is born of *agape*, the love that 'seeketh not its own.' It is utterly, absolutely, and completely selfless. It is God's love for men, for every separate and individual man. It depends in nothing upon man's worth, and is wholly independent of anything in any man. It is wholly dependent upon God. Such love as this is His Very Nature. This is why God loves every 'you' and every 'me' with a love that is immeasurably beyond all human comprehension. Such love is shown in the Cross, and in it there is nothing at all of self. This is not true of any human love, however splendid. It is true that perfect love casts out fear, but this is said of perfect *agape*. Fear is born of *eros*, and where there is *agape* there cannot be *eros*. *Philia* (brotherly-love) cannot cast out fear. This is why all purely human sentiments, even *philia* at its best, can never get rid of war. *Agape* is the love which saves, and it saves by its complete and utter devotion. This is the love of the Cross, and it is Divine. It is foreshadowed in the Old Testament in such a passage as our text. It reaches its fullness in Jn 3^{16}.

This Divine love, this *agape*, can be found in men, but not necessarily, nor by nature. It can be born in us by faith, and by faith alone. This involves a complete and utter reliance upon God. At the back of this is an absolute love for God, the One who died for us whilst we were yet sinners. If we would show true sympathy, the sympathy which saves the world, then love for man is not enough. In practice, it breaks down. The more you do for some men, the worse they are—and at last you get tired. *Philia* cannot endure against unceasing ungratefulness and greediness of men. *Agape* alone can endure, because it is born of God. This is why 'Love your neighbour' is the Second Commandment—Second, not First. The First is that we should love our God with an 'A'—with Agape, with All our heart, and All our soul, and All our strength. This is the root of the sympathy of God, and it issues in Christian sympathy.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Pride That Separates.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL CHARLES S. DUTHIE, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us.'—Lk $9^{49f.}$.

This incident thrusts upon us a sharp contrast. It is the contrast between two ways of conceiving the Christian community. The one is that of the disciples. It is mean and unimaginative and issues, characteristically, in a petty act of exclusion. The other is that of Jesus. It is discerning where the first is blind, positive where the first is negative, welcoming a man in where the first shuts him out. On the one side you have the attempt to set precise bounds to the Church and to regard anything done in the name of Christ beyond those bounds as done without authority and therefore to be instantly prohibited. On the other side you have the recognition that only God knows where the frontiers of the Church are to be drawn, that He has a sovereign freedom to act through men who answer to His call, wherever and however received, and that men may be one in the ultimate passionate loyalty to Christ but at some variance as to how this loyalty should express itself in life.

How do these two conceptions, and the attitudes bound up with them, come into conflict in this story? They clash over an individual. He is a shadowy, unknown disciple who leaps suddenly from the void into the Biblical narrative only to fall back with equal suddenness into the void. If his appearance is brief, it is also very significant. This man is a symbol. He represents something with which the Church has to grapple in every age. We may call it the religion which finds it hard to come to terms with the religious community and the religious institution, the Christianity which is imperfectly integrated with the Church. It may take the shape of a movement

that seeks to recapture some lost or neglected element in the total Christian gospel—the Salvation Army, Christian Science, the Oxford Group. More often it is seen in isolated individuals who strive heroically to live the Christian life outside the Christian fellowship, fated, it would almost seem, to misunderstand that fellowship and, in turn, to be misunderstood by it. But this Christianity-on-the-fringe is found within the organized Church itself. It is an attitude and a mood and a tendency we sometimes discover in ourselves. It is our protest against the Church when she is satisfied with herself. It is our impatience with the Church when she disowns those whom Christ would not disown. It is our refusal to commend the Church when she gives herself out to be the one hope for the individual and society and complacently remains the biggest single obstacle to the accomplishment of her aim.

Let us look at the attitude of the disciples and the attitude of Jesus towards this man. For John and his companions the unknown healer was simply some one who was doing the right thing in the wrong way. By acting independently he was in danger of bringing upon Jesus the reproach that His forces were divided. His lone ministry made it doubtful whether he himself had been properly authorized. After all, they were the chosen friends and helpers of the Master. Theirs was the right way and therefore the only way of doing what God wanted. To pursue other ways was to head straight for disaster. Had not Jesus Himself told them that a house divided against itself cannot stand? A good case can be made out for the disciples, but in the light of the sure insight of Jesus no justification, however plausible, will hide the essential littleness of their action and of the spirit that prompted it. We have here the beginnings of that fearful thing, the totalitarian mind; for what is the totalitarian mind, whether it be in science, in philosophy, in politics, or in religion but the mind that worships its own little system of truth and constitutes itself the guardian of that system and refuses to recognize the existence of any truth beyond it? 'If you do not follow with us,' it cries, 'you do not follow at all.'

The rebuke of Jesus that follows is as soft as a caress and as crushing as a hammer-blow. He might with good reason have praised the man. If He hated the frothy piety that dies in sentiment and fine words, He loved the religion that hurries hot-foot into action. Here was one who was giving himself splendidly to the healing that was an integral part of the New Order of the Kingdom. Moreover, he was doing it in Christ's name. That argued some deep-going loyalty to Jesus, founded perhaps upon some life-changing personal encounter. Instead, He says, 'Forbid him not, for he that is not against us is for us.' Read that out of its context and it is plain falsehood or dubious half-truth. Read it in its context and what a magnificent affirmation it carries with it! 'You have been asking the wrong question,' Jesus tells them. 'You have been asking yourselves "Why is he not *with* us?" when you ought to have been asking yourselves "Is he *for* us?" The important thing is not whether he is fighting *by our side*, but whether he is fighting *on our side*.' Thus Jesus reminds them that the cause they represent is bigger by far than their representation of it. The fellowship into which He has brought them embraces a wider variety of service and permits a larger range of freedom than they have yet dreamed possible. The frontier of the Kingdom must be pushed out to include all who give Christ their allegiance and battle under the flag of the one Supreme Commander.

What Jesus does here is to bring forcibly before us the fact that the Christian community is distinct from every other community in its power to combine conviction with tolerance and fellowship with freedom. 'The true difference between a crowd and a fellowship,' wrote John Oman, 'is that in the former we help to sweep each other off our feet and that in the latter it is our supreme task to help one another to find our own feet.' The pseudo-fellowships of our time, such as Fascism and Communism, know how to sweep men off their feet. They have generated fanatical loyalties and released incalculable energies in their exploitation of the human need to belong. Christianity must evoke an even greater surrender and an even stronger solidarity. We desperately need a fellowship that can lift us above ourselves. Thank God, when the Christian Church is true to her vocation and her Lord she is able both to sweep us off our feet and to help us to stand upon our own feet. She pulls us out of the stagnant backwater in which a false notion of individual freedom has isolated us into the fresh, flowing current of her own life, but only that we may find our true freedom in working out our own faith within the fellowship in obedience to the light God gives to each. Have we in the Church to-day the courage to live in the power of such a vision of fellowship in freedom and freedom in fellowship? Many are seeking a Church which, while making tremendous affirmations about God and man, is prepared to welcome into her company all who are prepared to be learners in the school of Christ. They need a Church that stands foursquare on a given, supernatural gospel and at the same time recognizes with the author of *Ecce Homo* that Jesus gave men not only truths but the power of arriving at truth and follows Jesus in refusing to shut down a barrier upon the questing mind, because it trusts men to come through experience and by the Providence of God to the final and saving insight. It is a fearful thing if men are finding scant evidence in our Christian congregations of a Church with this kind of large-minded and large-hearted fellowship. Are we shutting ourselves up in the prison of a narrow conception of the Great Community? If the place we live in as Christians is small, it is not because God has small designs but because we are small people. It is of little use putting our faith in a great gospel if we are not prepared to fashion a great Church to be the bearer of that gospel. The Christian message is either confirmed or caricatured by the life of the Church which proclaims it. The Church must not only be a herald of the Good News: she

must become herself a part of it. And she can only become a part of it as she is filled with Christ's boundless love for men and is constrained by that love to fashion for them the fellowship that is the mother of freedom.

Christ is speaking here to His disciples and through them to His Church. But He is also speaking, although less directly, to the individual who follows Him sincerely but finds it hard to align himself with the organization that bears Christ's name. His first and most searching question to such an individual is 'Are you for me or against me?' This is a question no one can evade. Each of us must make up his mind about Christ. But Jesus puts another question, 'Are you for Me and My people, for Me and My Church or are you against us?' Notice that Jesus says 'He that is not against *us* is for *us*.' In other words, while He makes it plain that the final thing is a man's attitude to Himself, He refuses to separate Himself from His Church. In the last analysis you cannot be for Christ without being for His Church and you cannot be for Christ and His Church without *in some way* being with them. Doesn't this mean that the man on the fringe must learn to move nearer and nearer to the centre of the Christian fellowship, however poor that fellowship may seem to be? We are very conscious, perhaps too conscious, of the imperfections of the Church. When these imperfections shout aloud at us, we may feel like agreeing with Michael Roberts when, in his book, *The Modern Mind*, he tells us that 'the congregation of the Church to-day does not represent the best and most courageous elements either in a moral, an intellectual or a spiritual sense.' We may be quite convinced that since it cannot be right either to accept the Church as she is or to scrap the Church and make a fresh start, what we must do is by the help of God to reform and change the Church. But we must go further and see that the Church of which we dream can only be realized at a price. The price is that we must identify ourselves with the sick and broken Church of to-day.

In Rex Warner's novel, *The Professor*, the Professor tries to find a point of agreement between his own thought and the Christian philosophy of the old cobbler. 'I have always said,' he tells the old man, 'that the tyrant himself is no better than a slave.' The cobbler cries out immediately in protest, 'It is not possible to be better than a slave. It is not possible to be higher than the lowest,' and then goes on to show that there is no salvation save by entering into and becoming one with the sufferings of the humblest. Love does not look down, it stoops down. This was what God Himself did when He came to us in Christ and shared our life. He stood by our side. He entered into our situation. He took our sins upon His own heart. The genuineness of a man's faith is known by his willingness to make his own life one with that of the Church in its seeming brokenness and impotence. Such identification may be costly, but it is the gateway to true joy and fellowship. The man who makes it is following Him who was not ashamed to call us His brethren.

Christ's word to the Church that excludes the Christian on the fringe and His word to the Christian on the fringe who remains apart from the Church and perhaps suspicious of it are, properly understood, the same word. He is addressing Himself in both instances to the pride that separates: the pride of an exclusive Church that cuts off the nonconforming individual and the pride of the solitary Christian who thinks the Church too sorry a representation of living Christianity to be worth joining. Such pride can only be broken by the humility and love that come with a new awareness of the humility of God's love to us. When we see how far and at what cost God has travelled in order to bridge the gulf between Himself and us, we grow ashamed of our petty separations and begin to long and to work for the great fellowship that makes Christian men free and for the Christian freedom that makes the Church truly a fellowship. We are for Christ and His people and because we are for them we are also with them.

The Church and Christian Marriage To-day.[1]

By the Reverend A. Herbert Gray, D.D., London.

The present alarming breakdown of marriages which now confronts us has inevitably produced a great deal of fresh thinking about the whole conception of Marriage. And that in turn has challenged the Christian Church to make clear her position. If the Church can offer to the nation a definite and inspiring conception, and if she takes pains to bring up the young to understand that conception and further to see that those about to marry are given adequate preparation and a knowledge of what Marriage involves, physically, mentally, and spiritually, then she will be making the supremely valuable contribution to the whole problem.

Sweeping generalizations about 'the young to-day' based on the knowledge of the failures in marriage no doubt do grave injustice to the majority of the rising generation. But there is considerable evidence suggesting that great numbers of young people enter on marriage very

[1] In writing this article I have spoken for myself, and not for the Marriage Guidance Council of which I happen to be Chairman. That Council has made no declaration on the question of Divorce.

lightly and therefore later discard it lightly. Some seem to regard it as little more than a form after which they may enter on physical intimacy, and if after a while marriage presents them with problems, and turns out to be at times unhappy and disappointing, they claim the right to bring it to an end.

Nor will it do to put all this down to the War. War inevitably and always has disruptive influences on the sex life of men and women, for reasons which it is now not necessary to explain in detail. But the present lax attitude to marriage was present before the War, and it will not end with the coming of peace. Responsible and intelligent persons are preaching views about sex activity which would disrupt society, and are a terrible menace to the stability of family life. And the stability of family life is the bedrock of a stable and great nation.

What, then, is the Christian conception of Marriage ?

(1) To begin with, all Christian Churches declare it to be something ' instituted by God.' It is not an arrangement devised by man. It is not merely something sanctioned by the State, and controlled by laws. It is a Divine institution. God enters, or is willing to enter, into all true marriages as a third party. The marriage vows of Christians are exchanged in His presence and His blessing is pronounced on all who enter on the new estate.

(2) Further, it was ordained ' for the mutual society, help, and comfort which husband and wife ought to have the one for the other.' Not only for what each may get, but for what each may give.

(3) Thirdly, it was ordained for the bringing up of children in the nurture of the Lord.

(4) And fourthly, it involves the promise of life-long fidelity and love. (The word ' obey ' has dropped out of the vows asked of women in most Churches.)

Marriage, then, is not Christian unless it involves the purpose to have children, unless the motive of it is genuine love, and unless it is entered on with an honest intention of making it a life-long partnership. It is a fact to be deplored that many men and many women marry for money or for social position, and that their marriages are none the less celebrated in churches. And it is equally unseemly that those who marry without love, ask and receive the blessing of the Church on their marriages.

About these essential points it may be claimed that all Christian Churches are agreed, however little is done in some quarters, to proclaim these views. But there are matters about which the Churches are not yet fully agreed, and which perplex many honest minds.

There is the modern problem of contraceptives. Probably it is true that this question is in eighty to ninety per cent. of the nation a settled question. It is settled because women have made up their minds about it. They claim the right to space their children, to decide with their husbands how many children they are going to have, and yet to continue living with their husbands in love's intimacies after they have had as many children as they can afford.

And if it is still asked, ' But are they right in making this decision ? ' the answer must depend on what we believe about the place of sex intimacy in life, and on what the real value of sex intercourse is for men and women. If it is to be regarded as justified only for the production of children, then women have made a wrong decision. But if it is regarded as a sacramental matter—as an expression in the terms of the body of a love which is also a spiritual fact, then the women have made a right decision.

And those who know how much a regulated life of sex activity does in releasing nervous tension, in giving healthy emotional outlet and in strengthening the bonds between husband and wife, will have no doubts left. It was a Lambeth Conference that declared that sexual intercourse between married lovers has value apart from the desire to produce children. (The actual words are mine, A. H. G.)

Passing from that question, there remains the question of Divorce which necessarily occupies much attention to-day. (54,000 decrees nisi were granted in 1947.) And here the Churches do not speak with one voice. The Roman Catholic Church claims to be wholly and unalterably opposed to all Divorce save in certain cases of non-consummation. But there are many reasons for which it will grant a decree of nullity. The Church of England is far from speaking with one voice about the matter, but shows signs of a tendency to-day to ' harden ' on the subject. The Church of Scotland has never made any official pronouncement. And the Free Churches in England on the whole have not recently made definite pronouncements, but certainly have not shown themselves always opposed to the re-marriage of divorced persons.

The present writer has a very strong repugnance to Divorce, having had much experience of the suffering it entails for all concerned, especially the children. For that reason he has for many years, by himself, and of late with and for the Marriage Guidance Council, spent much time in trying to promote reconciliation between husbands and wives, and so to avert any appeal to the Courts. It is very important that the grounds on which Divorce may be granted should be very carefully

considered. But it is even more important to try to prevent married couples from wanting Divorce.

None the less, it is impossible to escape the conviction that in some cases all moral reality has disappeared from what are still nominally marriages. And the real problem to be faced is 'What should be done in such cases?' I am entirely willing to assent to the statement that a marriage cannot be broken without sin—often the sin of both parties. But that admitted, it remains to face the question—'What should be done about broken marriages?' And no easy answer can be found. The suggestion is often made that the case could be met by judicial prolonged separation. But separation is the worst of all the proposed solutions. It is, to begin with, definitely a putting asunder of those who have been joined. And, further, it leaves in society two persons who are neither married nor single—unmarried apparently, yet not marriageable. Such persons often are acutely lonely. They retain the natural desire to love and to be loved. They still have strong passions. It would be best to face the fact, whether we like it or not, that separation leads to immorality.

But the question of Divorce still remains to be settled. The position of the State is clear enough, even if it should still in some respects be revised. It is the position of the Church that is not really settled. With exceptions, the Anglican Clergy refuse to re-marry divorced persons, and some go so far as to refuse them the Sacraments. The Church cannot prevent couples from obtaining Divorce but it can afterwards penalize divorced persons. Is this right? Is it Christian?

What about the innocent party? It is often cynically declared that there never is an innocent party. That is only true in the general sense that we are all sinners. But it is often wholly untrue in actual cases. Deserted husbands and deserted wives are never perfect saints because there are none in the world. But they often are men and women who have been cruelly and wantonly wronged by their partners. Sometimes the cruelty has been physical. Often it has been the more cruel form of cruelty called mental cruelty. Both men and women can become persons with whom it is impossible to live without torture, though they never use physical violence. The State, being apparently more merciful than some Churches, provides for the liberation of the victims in such cases. But many Christians would leave them bound.

We tend to exaggerate the importance of physical infidelity in the matter. It is not something which no self-respecting married person can forgive. It very often is most generously forgiven, so that marriage goes on, and often becomes most successful. Certain forms of cruelty, on the other hand, are evidence that love is dead. It is true that 'love never faileth.' But many marriages were based on love that was not of that quality, and so such love as there was died. Many married persons acutely dislike their partners. In fact it is often the case that as the days pass married persons discover that they are incurably incompatible. They never should have married. Perhaps in the future they will not marry, if the young learn how to choose their mates, and cease to marry at the bidding of mere physical attraction, and under the compulsion of gusts of passion. But as things are, they present this problem of persons deeply incompatible, and yet married.

Here, surely, is a matter for wise, kindly, and unhurried judgment. In spite of some degree of incompatibility, many couples achieve success in marriage. Bernard Shaw, who delights in 'puckish' exaggerations, declares that men and women are, as such, incompatible. If so, it only remains to say that often they succeed in mastering their incompatibility.

But when the incompatibility is profound, and ineradicable, what is to be said and done? It is often said, 'Those whom God has joined, let no man put asunder.' But did God join the incompatibles? Did God join the man and woman who married for money or without love? Appeals to that verse should be used with caution.

Another thing often said is that the innocent and suffering partner should accept his or her cross and, by the help of God, endure to the end. But if the cross is imposed on a man or a woman by a mistaken judgment of a Church that is both human and Divine, it may be that God would call for the lifting of that cross. There are crosses enough in most lives, and we would do well to make sure that we do not impose crosses on one another unnecessarily.

Further, accepted crosses can indeed be carried by the help of the grace of God. But the acceptance of a cross imposed by man is very difficult to achieve. Is it even always right? Has not much human progress resulted from the refusal of oppressed persons any longer to endure their bonds? Real experience of real husbands and wives tends generally to shake dogmatic convictions against Divorce.

There is, however, one way of disposing of all these difficult questions. It is taken by those who quote the words of Christ as recorded in Mt 5^{32}—'Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.' That, say such persons, closes the matter. And some of them show a desire to get rid of the words 'saving for

the cause of fornication.' But does that close the question? At least there are many people who do sincerely wish to know what is the truly Christian position to take, who hesitate to use such a summary method.

Can we really believe that Christ wished by one emphatic verse to legislate for all future time, and to decide all the varied problems which a very different social situation presents?

I understand that the Early Church allowed Divorce for adultery; and later when a situation arose, also for desertion. And so doing she ceased to regard these words of Christ as a fixed, unalterable edict, and used them as indicating a spirit to be applied.

I have known one or two girls who were wooed by attractive scoundrels, carried off their feet, and married. They were promptly used cruelly, and made frightened. They ran away. And having no difficulty in getting evidence, they divorced the men who had wronged them.

Years later true love came into their lives. Are they to be debarred from marriage and motherhood because of an early mistake made when they were very young and very ignorant?

The very suggestion seems to me cruel; and to label as Christian an attitude which is in fact cruel, is one of the most serious mistakes man or woman can make—indeed a horrible mistake.

Many do not believe that in that way we shall really interpret Christ truly for our day. It is quite plain that He wished to protect wives from the cruelty of being 'put away.' But do we know what He would say when both man and wife earnestly desire to part, or about the situation created by desertion? Can we be wrong in believing that He would always be against the cruel solution?

A final point remains to be considered. To any Christian mind the claims of children are supreme. Their welfare is of the first importance. And there is no doubt at all but that in many cases that is a very strong reason why husbands and wives should hold together, even after they have ceased to have joy in each other. Often they can maintain a stable home for the children, and so give them a sound foundation for their lives. But that is not all that must be said at this point. There are homes in which the bitter wrangling between husband and wife destroys all peace and well-being for all concerned—in which the noise of strife frightens the children—in which a shocking conception of marriage is held before their eyes.

It is not fit that young children should live in such houses, and when the suggestion of Divorce is made, it might truly be said, 'Yes, for the sake of the children.'

Contributions and Comments.

A Suggested Exegesis of 2 Kings v. 15–18.

'Now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel.' This confession of full monotheism by Naaman has always perplexed commentators. For one thing it antedates Deutero-Isaiah by centuries. For another, it contradicts the context and Naaman's own request for two mules' burden of earth, by which obviously he hopes to worship the purely local God Yahweh by 'standing on Yahweh's own ground' in Syria.

The suggestion is here made that there is no such whole-hearted expression of monotheism. For 'earth' we should read 'land' according to accepted Hebrew practice of using the word interchangeably to fit specific contexts. He refers here not to Yahweh but to Elohim. He is not saying that Yahweh is the god of the whole earth. He is saying that Elisha's God Yahweh is a true Elohim. He can do for him what no other Elohim in the land can do. Israel's Elohim has proved himself the best of Gods.

In the next verse he confirms this. He wants to take with him some of Yahweh's ground—to instal Israel's Elohim in Syria. In *v.*[18] he seeks to rationalize his conduct. Rimmon is the Assyrian god of thunder. Surely there is not here a case of conscience. He is trying to solve a delicate problem of syncretism. What will be Rimmon's attitude towards an incoming Elohim? More important, how will Yahweh react?

This, surely, removes a standing difficulty, and brings the whole incident into line with the contemporary monolatry.

A. T. Rich.

Axminster.

Luke xvi. 10.

The Authorized and Revised Versions of this parallelistic aphorism differ only in two points, (1) for A.V.'s 'that which is least' R.V. has 'in a very little': (2) for A.V.'s 'unjust' R.V. has 'unrighteous.' Is not the statement in these translations untrue? For a man may be faithful in that which is least or in a very little and also be unfaithful in much and a man may be unjust or unrighteous 'in a very little' or 'in the least'

and yet be just or righteous in much. Since the verse is part of Jesus' answer to the Pharisees who have made a charge against Him the statement or aphorism must be applicable to them. In Lk 11[42] Jesus says, 'But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue (" that which is least " or " in a very little ") . . . and pass over judgment and the love of God (" much ").' Jesus knew the scrupulosity of the Pharisees about jots and tittles of the letter of the Law, about tithes on the smallest produce and gains, about washing hands before meals, and a host of other very minor 'traditions.' He knew, too, that these scrupulous men robbed widows' houses! Surely such men were faithful in a very little and unfaithful in much. Amongst ourselves we all know the type of man who has no scruple about defrauding a big firm but would never dream of cheating a poor woman, just as we have also the type of man who commits petty thefts but would never be guilty of large embezzlement.

The correct translation should run—'He who is faithful in that which is least (or " in a very little ") *and* in much is faithful: and he that is unjust (or " unrighteous ") in the least (or " in a very little ") *and* in much is unjust (or unrighteous).' This rendering is (1) true to the linguistic idiom employed; (2) is a true statement or a statement of aphoristic truth; (3) is *ad hoc, i.e.*, suitable to the occasion of its utterance; (4) is *ad homines, i.e.*, applicable to the men addressed. Jesus is stressing the fact that a really faithful man is faithful in all degrees and all along the line and the really unjust man (or unrighteous man) is unjust in all degrees and all along the line. The Pharisees were faithful (or appeared to be so) at one or two or even many points but were yet unfaithful or unjust at other vastly more important points. Jesus holds up the real or ideal character as being of one seam throughout. The Pharisee was a strange mixture of real (or pretentious real) and unreal—he gave himself out as real while in reality he was most unreal. The hypocrisy of the Pharisees 'was not only a failure on the part of men who made a great profession of religion to do what they knew to be good, it was a failure to think out the practical application of their religious principles in their relations with other men' (C. A. Anderson Scott, *New Testament Ethics*, 45).

Perhaps a grammatical explanation of the misleading if not wrong A.V. and R.V. renderings may be offered—the verb esti(n) ἐστι(ν) should appear twice in each half of the parallelism—before as well as after πιστός and before as well as after ἄδικος. There is little doubt that, taking the text as it stands, the second πιστός and the second ἄδικος must go with the ἐστι(ν) in the text. This ἐστι(ν) is the ἐστι(ν) of strong affirmation. If the scholars who maintain that Lk 16 is a translation from original Hebrew or Aramaic are right, attention can be directed to the fact that in Hebrew the copula *is, are*, etc. is not usually expressed (Davidson, *Grammar*[18], p. 31) and to the fact that the verb 'to be' in Hebrew (הָיָה) is often strongly factitive or asseverative. In this verse (Lk 16[10]) ἐστι(ν) may be said to embrace both the copulative and asseverative uses of εἰμι and הָיָה (Lk 16[15b] and [16a] are nearby further examples of the unexpressed copula).

FRED. C. ANDERSON.

Dundee.

Entre Nous.

A Picture.

Dr. J. W. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro, has an elaborate article in *The Modern Churchman* for March on the doctrine of the Spirit, with the title 'Spirit and Spirit.' We give one of the most interesting passages. 'We are now in a position to attempt to outline a picture. . . . Let us picture the human spirit as a patterned unit, not discrete and isolated from other such units, and all emanating from one great spiritual source and not severed from that source. " The secret solidarity of the human race we cannot escape from," says Professor Radhakrishnan, " it cannot be abolished by the passing insanities of the world." That solidarity is due to the fact that each spirit is brought into being by the creative activity of the one Spirit. That one Spirit is evidently actuated by a will to variety, and creates various creators. Unless creators are created nothing is created; but creators are created, shot off like sparks, but unlike sparks not broken off and detached from the parent fire. . . . The creation of creators would appear to be the main purpose of the universe, the production and development of spirits in association with each other and in communion with their Creator. . . . Each spirit and all spirits together are inseparable from the Divine Spirit apart from whom they would fall into nothingness and dissolution.'

What Life Has Taught Me.

There is no greater modern master of the anthology and of the symposium than Sir James Marchant; and in his latest collection, *What Life Has Taught Me* (Odhams Press; 10s. 6d. net), he has given us what must be quite the most interesting symposium he has ever produced. He has assembled a team of men and women whose names are household words for eminence in almost every sphere of life and has bidden them tell us what life has taught them. There are twenty-five members of this team. Here, on the same platform as it were, we have Dean Inge and E. V. Knox, General Carpenter of the Salvation Army and

Father Martindale of the Society of Jesus, Viscount Templewood and Margaret Bondfield, Bertrand Russell and Sir Seymour Hicks. The book presents us with an astonishing variety of human achievement and it is prefaced with a short Introduction written with all the grace and wisdom of which Gilbert Murray is such a master.

All the writers have but two characteristics in common. First, they are all fairly well advanced in years. Sir Seymour Hicks tells how during the War his entertaining duties were to take him on a sea voyage of exceptional danger. Prudently he desired to insure his life before he set out. The Insurance Company official asked him how old he was and Sir Seymour admitted to seventy years. Whereupon he was told that it was quite impossible to insure his life. 'As you see,' said the official, 'at the age of three score years and ten, medically, you are dead.' Whatever else these writers are they are anything but dead. But their years might very easily have made this book a succession of articles by *laudatores temporis acti*. But there is not even a suggestion of that. The second characteristic that all the contributors share is that they are famous. The book might very easily have become a succession of portentous and pontifical utterances. But in it there is a strange and rather wonderful humility. 'One thing I have certainly learned,' says Dean Inge, 'not to have a good opinion of myself.' 'Let the scientific Pharisee make what boast he will,' says L. P. Jacks, 'but God be merciful to me an ignoramus.'

For the most part these writers are masters of words and the vivid phrase flashes out again and again. Dean Inge tells how in addressing the Worshipful Company of Spectacle Makers he said, 'We clergy are spectacle makers, whose job it is to help people with every degree of myopia to see the invisible—a difficult job.' Father Martindale, from his teaching experience, describes boys as 'an agreeable mixture of mule and mystic.' Sir William Beach Thomas relates the saying of an old Cowley Father, 'To seek to attain happiness by a succession of pleasures is as foolish as trying to keep up a light all night by striking successive matches.' L. P. Jacks has the wonderful sentence, 'I think the Five Senses are the Five Gateways of the Holy Ghost,' and, in lighter vein, he tells us that his study of the theologians and the philosophers makes him think sometimes of the Oxford scholar who became so learned in the classics that he did all his thinking in Greek and Latin, but had to consult the dictionaries to find out what it meant. Sir Miles Thomas wisely and beautifully says, 'To me, the sublimation of the highest form of friendship is the ability to sit in silence.' Mary Agnes Hamilton quotes the saying of Henry James, 'After all the great thing is to give. It's what plays one least false.' E. V. Knox quotes the penetrating judgment of the daughter of a country vicar which was directed against himself. She had accused him of having no ambition. He had pointed out that by that sin the angels fell. Her answer, devastatingly enough, was, 'I think that you will always be able to find an excuse for not doing what you don't want to do.'

It would be easy for a book like this to have a certain cynical weariness in it, to go on the principle that youth is a blunder and old age a regret. Viscount Jowitt in fact does quote the saying that 'youth is the age at which you think of the naughty things you will do; the prime of life is when you do them and old age is when you wish you had not.' But there is little of that spirit in this book. There is rather a lovely serenity, a mellow wisdom and a realization that the simplest things are in the end the greatest things. The late Earl of Lytton wrote, 'The gates of heaven are open all round us for those who have eyes to see through them. Such services as I have been able to render have been lavishly recompensed by high honours and decorations; but one of my most cherished memories is the honour paid me one day by a little girl in the Whitechapel Road, who put her hand in mine and said, "Please, sir, will you pass me across the road?"' L. P. Jacks has a paragraph in which he outlines the characteristics of a Christian gentleman:

> 'A warm-hearted and open-handed gentleman, a good Samaritan and a good neighbour, beloved by all decent folk and feared only by scoundrels; thinking evil of no man, long-suffering towards fools; a fair dealer, a loyal friend, a welcome companion and a sound sportsman; free from envy, greed and censoriousness; a man of charity, compassion, gratitude and kindly humour; ideal in his aims, business-like in his methods; fond of children, flowers and all beautiful things; considerate to servants, chivalrous to women, kind to animals, courteous to all men, penitent in the house of God, humble in the presence of the Sphinx, but a terrible fellow when Apollyon has to be dealt with; brave in danger, patient in sickness, cheerful in misfortune, radiant in gloom, temperate in prosperity, resolute in adversity, calm in the face of death.'

If a man learned that lesson from life he has learned well indeed.

We may note in passing that E. V. Knox declares that 'Demosthenes, searching London with an arc-light, would not discover a humourless man.' It was Diogenes, not Demosthenes, who, with his lantern, sought to find an honest man. Strange that a classical slip could occur in a book with a Preface by that great classicist, Professor Gilbert Murray.

This is a book with a feast of good things in it; a man will not only enjoy reading it but, having read it, he will be a better man.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION

FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY

London University degree examinations are open to all. University residence is unnecessary. Candidates may read at home; those over 23 may take the shorter Special Entrance, instead of the Matriculation, Examination.

Many ministers have secured London B.A., B.D. & M.Th. degrees through entrusting their entire preparation to Wolsey Hall. In the hands of experienced and sympathetic graduate tutors studying for a Degree at home becomes a pleasure. Fees are moderate, and may be spread over the period of the Course. Moreover, should you be compelled to suspend or discontinue the Course, for *any* reason, *no* further instalments are payable beyond those due at the time. In the event of failure, tuition is continued *free of charge.*

HEBREW IS NOT NOW REQUIRED

for a Pass at London B.D.

Under the latest Regulations it is possible to obtain a *Pass* at London B.D. without offering Hebrew. To gain Honours, Candidates must still offer this subject

PROSPECTUS

and particulars of the new Regulations may be obtained post free and without incurring the least obligation from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 44,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.

PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS

TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.

LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS

EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

(*Just Issued*—**8th Edition**)

THE MENACE OF

FREEMASONRY

TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY

Rev. C. PENNEY HUNT, B.A.

3s. 7½d.

(Post Free)

FREEDOM PRESS, BREASTON, DERBY

INDEPENDENT PRESS

From the Hillside
G. GLENN ATKINS, D.D.
A study of the Sermon on the Mount and its message for to-day. Written by an eminent American theologian.
Crown 8vo. 96 pp. Cloth Boards. **5s. net.**

Thinking Again about the Future Life
S. MAURICE WATTS, B.D.
Discusses some of the less familiar aspects of immortality. What happens after death? In what condition do we live on?
Crown 8vo. 80 pp. Stiff Boards. **4s. net.**

The Church in the Atomic Age
H. F. LOVELL COCKS, M.A., D.D.
An urgent, vital subject that should receive consideration by every thinking man and woman. This booklet is commended for immediate study and discussion in Church meetings.
Crown 8vo. 24 pp. Paper Covers. **9d. net.**

God and Time
JOHN MARSH, M.A., D.Phil.
Three Broadcast Talks given during the Christmas season. The wonder and glory of what God has done for us, and will do for us, in Him who was born on the first Christmas day.
Crown 8vo. 40 pp. Paper Covers. **1s. net.**

The Church and the Sacraments
P. T. FORSYTH, M.A., D.D.
'To be a Christian is not to attach one's salvation to a grand individual but it is to enter Christ; and to enter Christ is in the same act to enter the Church which is in Christ.'
Large Crown 8vo. 310 pp. Cloth Boards. **10s. 6d. net.**

Roman Catholicism and Freedom
C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D., D.Litt.
'There is nothing here of theology, nothing about transubstantiation or indulgences or the confessional or any Roman dogma. It is a question of freedom that is raised. Would Rome persecute to-day? That is the main question Dr. Cadoux asked and answered.'
The Expository Times.
Crown 8vo. 208 pp. Cloth Boards. **7s. 6d. net.**

Popular Hymns and their Writers
NORMAN MABLE
Interesting facts concerning popular Christian hymns, and concise biographical sketches of nearly 200 writers, gathered from many sources.
Crown 8vo. 216 pp. Cloth Boards. **7s. 6d. net.**

Marriage: Tie or Tangle
N. A. TURNER SMITH, M.A., B.Litt.
'It is noteworthy both for its real insight into the problems of married life and for its keen discernment of the main guiding principles of Christian marriage. These are exactly the kind of talks which increasingly Christian ministers will find themselves driven to give.'
The Christian World.
Crown 8vo. Two Colour Jacket. Stiff Boards.
3s. 6d. net.

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.
MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON, E.C.4

T. & T. CLARK

Just published :—

MANUAL OF ELOCUTION FOR THE MINISTRY

By the Rev. FRANK PHILIP
Lecturer in sacred Elocution, University of Edinburgh.

To discharge worthily the duties of the Christian ministry, of which preaching forms so important a part, a man must have his voice properly and completely trained and disciplined. The best and nothing but the best is due. Expert tuition *viva voce* is essential for this. To provide the guidance for this tuition, by setting forth the principles and the theories on which it is based, is the function of this Manual.

Crown 8vo. with four diagrams **6s. net**

Again available :—

GRIMM'S GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
Translated, Revised and Enlarged by Prof. J. H. THAYER, D.D. 4th Edn. **32s. net**

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS
(International Theological Library)
Canon C. H. ROBINSON, D.D. **16s. net**

OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY
Prof. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D. **16s. net**

THE GOSPEL HISTORY AND ITS TRANSMISSION
Prof. F. C. BURKITT, D.D. 3rd Edn. **14s. net**

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES
(International Critical Commentary)
Prof. J. H. ROPES, D.D. **16s. net**

THE FOURTH GOSPEL: Its Purpose and Theology
Prof. E. F. SCOTT, D.D. 2nd Edn. **11s. 6d. net**

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS: Its Doctrine and Significance
Prof. E. F. SCOTT, D.D. **9s. net**

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS
Prof. D. S. ADAM, D.D. **10s. net**

THE GALILEAN ACCENT
('Scholar as Preacher' Series)
Prof. A. J. GOSSIP, D.D., LL.D. **9s. net**

Obtainable through any Bookseller

38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH 2

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2.
AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD. LONDON, E.C.4.
ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7, 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*

Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net.
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.